Department Of Law

University of Calcutta

Hazra Campus

51/1, Hazra Rd, Ballygunge, Kolkata, West Bengal

700019

• By the Students • Of the Students • For the Students

1 ST SEMESTER ENGLISH

Initiated by:

ANANDA BISWAS (GENERAL SECRETARY)

Arranged by:

DIPSHIKHA BHANDARI

ANANDITA NANDY

(JOINT SECRETARIES OF ACADEMIC COMMITTEE)

Circulated by:

MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC COMMITTEE

Contact -

8240421377

+91 93305 15126

THANKS TO,

SURYAJYOTI SARKAR

(PRESIDENT)

Courtesy: DEPARTMENT OF LAW, CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY, HAZRA CAMPUS TMCP STUDENT'S UNIT

Table of Contents

TITLE **PAGE NO.**

1. About the committee……2
2. Objectives of the committee……...3
3. Acknowledgement……..4
4. Disclaimer ……..5
5. GROUP A

   Question I (5 marks)……...6

   Question II (10 marks)……..…34

   Question III (5 marks)……...50
6. GROUP B (2 marks)……..…62

About the Committee

The Academic Committee of the Department of Law at the University of Calcutta is a newly formed body established in the month of September, 2024, comprising dedicated students from all 5 years of the BA LLB program. This diverse committee is designed to foster a collaborative academic environment, drawing on the unique perspectives and experiences of its members to enhance the educational journey of the students.

With a total of 12 members, including two Joint Secretaries, the committee operates under the auspices of the Student Unit (TMCP) of Department of Law, University of Calcutta. Its primary mission is to develop comprehensive study materials and notes that cater to the specific needs of law students, ensuring they have access to essential resources for their academic success.

In addition to creating study materials, the committee is committed to provide valuable support through organized online doubt-clearing sessions and compiling lists of important exam questions. By engaging students from various academic years, the committee aims to create a vibrant community that encourages knowledge sharing and academic excellence across all levels of the BA LLB program. Through these initiatives, we aspire to empower students and enhance their understanding of legal concepts, preparing them for both examinations and future careers in law.

Objectives Of the Committee

The Academic Committee of the Department of Law at the University of Calcutta is dedicated to enriching the academic experience of BA LLB students through several key initiatives. A primary focus is developing comprehensive study materials, including high-quality, well-researched notes covering essential topics in the BA LLB curriculum. This ensures students have valuable resources to support effective learning and exam preparation.

To aid examination success, the committee curates and distributes a list of important questions and topics, helping students focus on critical areas and improve performance. Regular online doubt-clearing sessions further support students by providing a platform to clarify course content, ask questions, and engage in discussions on complex legal concepts.

The committee also emphasizes practical learning through workshops and seminars with legal professionals, offering insights into the legal field and connecting theoretical knowledge to real-world applications. Additionally, fostering a collaborative academic community is a priority, encouraging knowledge sharing and support among students across different years.

Looking ahead, the committee plans to introduce new initiatives such as guest lectures and legal research projects to further enhance the academic experience and prepare students for future careers in law.

Acknowledgement

The Academic Committee of the Department of Law at the University of Calcutta extends its heartfelt gratitude to all those who have supported the establishment and ongoing efforts of this committee. We would like to express our sincere appreciation to the University of Calcutta for providing a conducive environment for academic growth and innovation.

We are especially thankful to the Student Union members, ***Surya Jyoti Sarkar*** *(President) and* ***Ananda Biswas*** *(General Secretary) for their unwavering support and guidance, which has been instrumental in facilitating our operations and ensuring that student voices are effectively represented in our initiatives.*

We also appreciate the enthusiasm and commitment shown by our Committee Secretaries - ***Anandita Nandy and Dipshikha Bhandari*** *of 7th Semester and Executive Members – 9th Semester-* ***Ridhikamini Basu Mallick,*** *7th Semester -* ***Ritisha Majumder, Maitreyee Roy****, 5th Semester -* ***Anu Mondal, Manami Pramanick, Supriti Murmu****, 3rd Semester –* ***Diksha, Krishna Thakur, Pragya Shukla, Arkodyuti Pramanick, Debapriya Dutta*** *in working collaboratively to enhance the academic environment for law students. Together, we aim to create a vibrant learning atmosphere that prepares students not only for examinations but also for their future careers in law.*

Disclaimer

The notes mentioned in the pdf are prepared for assistance of students in the Department of Law, Calcutta University. They are aimed at supplementing the efforts of students. Students are sincerely advised to attend classes and study by themselves, using these notes only as a means of reference to enhance their knowledge for examinations. This Committee does not condone missing classes or forsaking of own research for academic purposes.

*Students are advised to mention the name of the play, playwright, act and scene at the beginning of the answers.

For example, the given line has been spoken by Portia in Act IV Scene 1 of the play, 'The Merchant of Venice' written by William Shakespeare.

GROUP -A

Question I

(5 MARKS)

1. Before you can come to a verdict guilty but insane, you must be well and thoroughly convinced that the condition of his mind was such as would have qualified him at the moment for a lunatic asylum"

This statement is made by the presiding judge in the Act II of the play justice written by John Galsworthy, articulating the critical standards that the jury must consider when deliberating on the verdict of Falder's case. The judge emphasizes that for the jury to arrive at a verdict of "guilty but insane," they must have a firm conviction regarding Falder's mental state at the time he committed the crime. This highlights the legal distinction between simply committing an offense and the mental capacity with which it was committed, thereby setting a high threshold for establishing insanity as a defence.

The judge clarifies that the jury cannot base their decision on mere emotional distress or impulsive actions; rather, they must evaluate whether Falder's mental condition was severe enough to warrant qualification for a lunatic asylum. This requires them to consider the evidence presented during the trial regarding his behaviour, thoughts, and overall mental health. The judge's reference to a lunatic asylum underscores the seriousness of the insanity plea, as it suggests that Falder's mental state would need to reflect a significant impairment in his understanding of reality to be classified as insane under the law.

Ultimately, this statement guides the jury to focus on the facts and evidence regarding Falder's mental health at the time of the forgery, rather than being swayed by factors such as his emotional turmoil or circumstances surrounding the crime. By emphasizing the need for thorough conviction, Justice Floyd ensures that the jury remains grounded in the legal definitions of insanity, reinforcing the principle that the justice system requires a high standard of proof when determining criminal responsibility. This careful approach serves to protect the integrity of the legal process and uphold the standards of accountability for those who commit crimes.

2. "You will go to penal servitude for three years"

This statement is delivered by Justice Floyd, the presiding judge in the trial of William Falder. This line comes after the judge's remarks after finding Falder guilty of forgery, a serious crime. The judge has meticulously outlined the factors that influenced his decision, weighing both the nature of the crime and the mitigating circumstances surrounding Falder's actions.

The judge emphasizes that despite Falder's youth, good character, and emotional distress at the time of the offense, the gravity of the crime committed cannot be overlooked. Falder's role as a clerk in a lawyer's office further aggravates the situation, as it signifies a breach of trust and knowledge of the legal implications of his actions. Justice Floyd's refusal to accept the defence's appeal for mercy, which he deems morally flawed, underlines his commitment to upholding the law and ensuring justice is served.

Ultimately, the sentence of three years in penal servitude reflects the judge's duty to maintain the integrity of the legal system while also considering the need for deterrence. The judge's decision aims to uphold societal standards and discourage similar behaviour in the future, reinforcing that even in the face of emotional turmoil, the rule of law must prevail. This sentencing decision demonstrates the delicate balance judges must strike between compassion for individual circumstances and the responsibility to the broader community.

3. "Really, gentlemen, this is so peculiar a proposition that I am not disposed to weary you with further argument"

This statement is made by Mr. Harold Cleaver, the prosecution counsel, during his closing remarks in the trial of Falder. In this part of the argument, Cleaver addresses the jury and responds to the defence's plea of temporary insanity put forth by Mr. Hector Frome. Cleaver

intends to highlight the perceived absurdity of the defence's argument that Falder was not responsible for his actions due to a temporary lapse into insanity.

By describing the defence as "peculiar," Cleaver implies that the claim lacks a logical foundation and does not align with common understandings of mental illness or criminal responsibility. He contends that the idea of someone being sane one moment and insane the next—specifically, in the critical moments surrounding the commission of the crime—is not only unusual but also a tactic to escape accountability.

Cleaver's phrase "not disposed to weary you with further argument" reflects his belief that the evidence has already sufficiently demonstrated the inadequacy of the defence's position. He seeks to streamline the jury's deliberation by urging them to dismiss what he sees as a convoluted and unconvincing plea. In doing so, Cleaver aims to reinforce the notion that the law should not bend to accommodate the emotional circumstances surrounding Falder's actions, thereby maintaining a focus on the facts of the case and the seriousness of the crime.

4. "I have merely shown you the background of life"-- that palpitating life which, believe me whatever my friend may say— always lies behind the commission of a crime.

In Justice by John Galsworthy, during the trial, defence counsel Mr. Hector Frome argues that understanding the context of a crime is crucial. He states, "I have merely shown you the background of life"—referring to the complex emotional landscape that influences individuals. In Falder's case, his criminal actions are deeply tied to the difficult circumstances surrounding Ruth Honeywill's life and his intense emotional connection to her. Frome suggests that these factors play a significant role in understanding why Falder committed his offense.

While the prosecution, led by Mr. Harold Cleaver, may dismiss Falder's relationship with Ruth as irrelevant or even contemptible, Frome emphasizes the reality of their situation. He insists that love and emotional turmoil cannot be overlooked, as they are fundamental to understanding the motivations behind criminal behaviour. The prosecution's focus on the crime itself neglects the underlying human experiences that led to it.

Frome contends that the emotional force of life—the love and desperation felt by both Falder and Ruth—is a critical element in assessing the nature of Falder's actions. By highlighting this emotional context, he urges the jury to consider the complexities of human relationships and

the profound impacts they can have, arguing that such feelings often drive individuals to act in ways that may seem irrational or criminal when viewed in isolation.

5. "But it just flashed across me that if I put the ty and the nought there would be the money to get her away."

In Justice by John Galsworthy, Falder experiences intense emotional turmoil as he reflects on his actions. He explains that when Ruth Honeywill leaves him, he is overwhelmed with fear and anxiety and unable to focus on anything. Falder describes a conversation with Davis, a fellow clerk, who notices his distress and suggests that a brief outing might help him clear his mind.

In a moment of desperation, while holding a cheque, an impulsive thought crossed his mind, if he altered the figures on the cheque, he could obtain the money needed to help Ruth escape her difficult situation. Falder recounts, "It just flashed across me that if I put the ty and the nought there would be the money to get her away." He emphasizes that this idea was fleeting, and he had not fully grasped the implications of his decision until it was too late. After cashing the cheque, he felt immediate regret, contemplating self-harm as he recognized the gravity of his actions. Despite this, he resolved to use the money to save Ruth, feeling trapped by his choices.

As Falder speaks, he wrestles with guilt and confusion, unable to comprehend how he could have acted in such a way. His narrative reveals the profound emotional struggle he faces, as well as the impulsive nature of his crime driven by love and desperation. Ultimately, Falder's reflections underscore the complexity of human emotions and the circumstances that can lead a person to commit offenses, highlighting the themes of passion, regret, and the desire to protect those we love.

6. "Prisoner of the bar you are convicted felony"

This line is taken from Justice by John Galsworthy, where, at the end of the cross-examination, the clerk of the Court of Justice announces, "Prisoner of the bar, you are convicted of felony." Responding to the judge's direction to call upon the prisoner, the clerk formally declares to Falder, the accused, that he stands convicted of a serious crime.

At this point, the court follows a standard procedure, offering Falder, as the accused, an opportunity to address the court directly before judgment is pronounced. This moment upholds a fundamental right of the accused—allowing him, as a human being, to present any final

statement or plea in his defence. Regardless of the trial's outcome or evidence presented, it is customary in the legal process for the accused to be given the chance to speak before the court finalizes its judgment. This practice honours the principle that the accused's perspective deserves to be heard, reflecting a measure of respect and fairness in the administration of justice.

7. "The law is what it is — a majestic edifice sheltering all of us "

In Justice by John Galsworthy, Judge Floyd, delivering his judgment, asserts, "The law is what it is—a majestic edifice sheltering all of us." Rejecting the defence's argument about double jeopardy presented by Mr. Hector Frome, Judge Floyd states that Falder, who has already served a prison term for forgery, deserves no leniency under the law for additional offenses. The judge emphasizes that Falder's actions, especially his pursuit of a married woman, are serious breaches both legally and morally, warranting further punishment.

Judge Floyd underscores the essential role of law in society, describing it as a structure built upon enduring principles that shape and stabilize social order. Law, he explains, is deeply embedded in the minds and lives of individuals, providing security and consistency that cannot be easily altered or adjusted for particular cases. Every provision of the law functions like a stone in a grand structure, supporting and strengthening the whole, creating a solid body of justice that upholds society's sanctity and order.

Thus, the judge refuses any departure from established legal practices or any special mercy for Falder. He maintains that the law's authority and integrity must be respected, and no exception can be made merely out of sympathy, as defence counsel Mr. Frome had pleaded. He argues that the law's permanence and role in safeguarding society must prevail.

8. "Justice is a machine that, when someone has once given it the starting push, rolls on itself"

This line is drawn from John Galsworthy's play Justice, where Mr. Hector Frome, the defence lawyer, passionately addresses the jury in a final plea on behalf of his client, Falder. Frome argues against the rigid and impersonal application of justice, which he compares to a machine. He explains, "Justice is a machine that, when someone has once given it the starting push, rolls on itself." He urges the jury not to issue a verdict that would send an unintentional offender back to prison, forever branding him and robbing him of any hope of redemption.

Frome illustrates how, once the wheels of the justice system turn against a weak and unfortunate individual like Falder, it traps him in an inescapable cycle, where any chance at freedom or rehabilitation is lost. The system, he argues, is overly orthodox and laden with complex rules, whose harsh application ensnares vulnerable individuals, stripping them of dignity and preventing their return to normal life. Frome's appeal is not for the cold, mechanized application of legal justice, but for a compassionate, humane approach that recognizes Falder's missteps without destroying his future.

9. "One wrong is no excuse for another"

This expression "One wrong is no excuse for another" has been delivered by the defence counsel Mr. Hector Frome during the Trial in the Court of Justice.

Mr. Hector Frome points out in his argument that one immoral act cannot be able to justify another wrongful act which it relates with.

The minds of both Ruth Honeywill and William Falder are constantly turned towards immoral acts and relation.

Falder, in the tragic circumstances, has committed the offence of forgery in the stress of urgency. He wanted to rescue Ruth, a married woman, from her tyrannical husband who used to ill-treat her and from whom she has no means of escape. He cannot do wrongful acts thinking of that woman and helping her with her life problems when her husband is still alive and no divorce took place between them.

It is also a wrong, a married woman cannot make a relation with an unmarried young man. She cannot set her whole hopes on him by planning to elope with him to South America and settle together as husband and wife where they both would be unknown.

Thus, these are the two wrongs which Mr. Hector Frome referred in this context.

10."It don't bear talking about."

In Justice by John Galsworthy, the line "It don't bear talking about" reflects the resignation and helplessness of characters confronted with difficult or painful truths they feel powerless to change. Ruth Honeywill, the woman Falder loves, says this line to convey the depth of her suffering and the hopelessness of her situation.

She is trapped in an abusive marriage, unable to escape due to social and economic constraints. When she says “It don’t bear talking about,” she is expressing that her struggles and the grim reality of her life are so overwhelming and painful that discussing them seems pointless, as it offers no solution or relief.

This line underscores the play’s themes of societal and personal confinement, as Ruth, like Falder, is caught in circumstances beyond her control. Both characters are trapped by rigid social structures and an unforgiving legal system that offers them little sympathy. Through Ruth’s resigned words, Galsworthy highlights the condition of individuals who suffer silently, unable to find justice or understanding in society.

11.“This was a desperate and, as my friend Mr. Cleaver will no doubt call it, an immoral resolution.”

The line was a desperate and, as my friend Mr. Cleaver will no doubt call it, an immoral resolution” was said by Mr Hector Frome, the defence counsel during the trial in the Court of Justice.

While explaining the circumstances which took place, he explained that the woman, Ruth Honeywill would confirm that the prisoner that is, Falder had done forgery for she had set up all hopes on him knowing the feeling with which she had inspired him.

She knew that Falder would take her away from all her misery and would settle into a new country with her where they both would be unknown and will pass as husband and wife there. This shows the desperation an immoral resolution since it’s both wrong how the forgery was done and also how they were in an illegal relationship. This points how their minds the constantly turned towards the wrong.

12.“Had you ever seen such a look in his eyes before?”

The line “Had you ever seen such a look in his eyes before?” was said by Mr Hector Frome, the defence counsel during the trial in the Court of Justice.

The context of this line is that he asked this question to Mr Robert Cokeson in the trial scene. Mr Robert Cokeson, the managing clerk of the Solicitor’s firm is put into the witness box. He is the first witness of the case because he is centre point of relations with his employers and

employees. He knows the nature, conduct and behaviour of all who are engaged in the office. He has the capacity to notice the feeling of the person in grave circumstances.

The day when Falder committed the offence of forgery, he looked peculiar. Cokeson had never seen such an abnormal look in Falder eyes. He used the term 'funny' as unusual instead of strange for Falder. His collar was unbuttoned and he stared at him and it was not nice. Actually, Mr Cokeson when he is in witness box in response to the Judge cannot explain the meaning of how it was funny.

When the defence counsel, Mr Hector Frome, asks him whether he had ever seen such a look in Falder's eyes before, Mr Robert Cokeson replies in negative way and he says if he had he should have spoken to the employers, Mr James How and Mr Walter How.

He also says that they cannot have anything eccentric in their profession.

13."Well, now Sir, what precisely do you mean by that word?"

The line "Well, now Sir, what precisely do you mean by that word?" was said by Mr Harold Cleaver the prosecution counsel.

He asked Mr Robert Cokeson that he said on the morning of the forgery the prisoner, Falder was jumpy. On the context of this, he asks what did he mean by that precise word 'jumpy'. Mr. Cokeson describes that if he has ever seen a dog that has lost its master, Falder was kind of everywhere at once.

Then Mr Cleaver asked him about his eyes and why he called it funny before since what may be funny to him may not be funny to the jury or any other person, he wanted him to explain whether they were shy or fierce or any other expression. Mr Cokeson replied that he finds it very difficult to explain but he detailed that his collar was unbuttoned on that day. He noticed it especially because Falder was generally a very clean and quiet person and was never caught in such a dishevelled state before.

14."The fact is patent that you committed this crime with the view of furthering an immoral design."

In 'Justice' by John Galsworthy, the line "The fact is patent that you committed this crime with the view of furthering an immoral design" is delivered by the Judge, Mr. Justice Floyd during the trial of the protagonist, William Falder. Falder is on trial for forgery, a crime he committed

to obtain money that would enable him and Ruth Honeywill, a woman trapped in an abusive marriage, to escape together.

The judge's words reflect the harsh and uncompromising stance of the judicial system, focusing solely on the legal structure and labelling Falder's motive as an "immoral design." The judge interprets Falder's actions as premeditated and morally wrong, dismissing the compassionate, desperate motivation behind them.

This line glorifies Galsworthy's critique of the justice system's failure to account for personal circumstances or morality, showing how rigid legal interpretations can deny the humanity of those it judges. The play as a whole explores the limitations of a legal system that overlooks individual struggles, emphasizing Galsworthy's call for a more empathetic approach to justice.

15."On the morning when my husband nearly killed me, my friend cried."

The line "On the morning that when my husband nearly killed me, my friend cried" has been delivered by Mrs Ruth Honeywill in response to the defence counsel Mr Hector Frome during the trial in the Court of Justice whether Falder had money to give her.

On Saturday, July 8th, Falder told her afterwards he had come with unexpected money. He gave her money to buy an outfit for her and the children and to get all ready to start for South America in order to settle for their future living.

On the morning when Mrs Ruth Honeywill's husband nearly killed her, her friend Falder cried out, hearing the situation because he did not have the money to get her away from her abusive husband. Although Falder afterwards came with the money which was unexpected. But he did not speak to her about a check which he had encashed.

16."It just flashed across me that if I put the ty and the nought, there would be the money to get her away."

In 'Justice' by John Galsworthy, the line "It just flashed across me that if I put the 'ty' and the 'nought,' there would be the money to get her away" is spoken by the protagonist, William Falder, as he explains his impulsive decision to commit forgery.

Falder, a young and vulnerable clerk, is in love with Ruth Honeywill, a woman suffering in an abusive marriage. He becomes desperate to help her escape her situation, and in a moment of panic and impulsive reasoning, he sees a quick, albeit illegal, solution.

Falder alters a check by adding a "ty" (for ninety) and a "nought" (zero) to increase its value from £9 to £90, intending to use the money to help Ruth. This moment reveals the character's inner turmoil, his desperation, and his lack of premeditation. The line underscores the impulsive, almost subconscious nature of his crime—it was a split-second decision driven by his compassion and desperation rather than malice or greed.

This moment highlights a central theme in Justice: the conflict between human emotion and the rigid, impersonal structure of the law. Galsworthy uses Falder's rash action to show how individuals under pressure can make poor choices, raising questions about whether strict punishment is always the fairest response.

17."He has not a strong face, but neither has he a vicious face."

The line "He has not a strong face, but neither has he a vicious face" is spoken by the character Cokeson in John Galsworthy's play Justice. This remark occurs during a discussion about William Falder, a young man who has committed forgery out of desperation to help Ruth, a woman trapped in an abusive marriage. Cokeson's observation reflects his nuanced understanding of Falder's character, suggesting that while Falder may lack physical strength or a commanding presence, he is not inherently malicious.

Cokeson's statement serves to humanize Falder, emphasizing that his crime was not born from wickedness but rather from a place of emotional turmoil and moral conflict. The context of this line is crucial; it highlights the broader theme of the play, which critiques the rigid and often unjust nature of the legal system. Galsworthy uses Cokeson's perspective to challenge the audience's perception of justice and morality, inviting them to consider the circumstances that lead individuals to commit crimes.

By portraying Falder as a sympathetic character rather than a typical criminal, Galsworthy underscores the flaws within the judicial system that fails to account for human emotions and motivations. This moment encapsulates the play's central critique: justice should be tempered with compassion and understanding, rather than being administered with blind severity. Thus, Cokeson's remark not only sheds light on Falder's character but also serves as a poignant commentary on the nature of justice itself.

18.“I beg you not to return a verdict that may thrust him back into prison and brand him forever”

The line “I beg you not to return a verdict that may thrust him back into prison and brand him for ever” is spoken by Hector Frome, the defense attorney, during the trial of William Falder in John Galsworthy’s play Justice. This plea occurs in Act II, as Frome attempts to sway the jury’s perception of Falder, who has committed forgery out of desperation to help Ruth, a woman trapped in an abusive marriage.

Frome’s statement reflects his deep concern for Falder’s future and the potential consequences of a guilty verdict. He emphasizes that a prison sentence would not only punish Falder for his crime but also permanently tarnish his reputation, branding him as a criminal. This moment underscores the play’s critique of the justice system, which often fails to consider the circumstances that lead individuals to commit crimes. Frome argues that Falder’s actions were driven by compassion rather than malice, suggesting that the law should account for human emotions and motivations.

This plea is significant as it encapsulates the central theme of Galsworthy’s work: the need for justice to be tempered with mercy and understanding. Frome’s heartfelt appeal challenges the jury to look beyond the letter of the law and consider the broader implications of their decision. By doing so, Galsworthy invites the audience to reflect on the flaws within a legal system that harshly punishes those who may be victims of circumstance rather than true criminals. Ultimately, Frome’s words serve as a poignant reminder of the human cost of rigid legalism and the importance of compassion in administering justice.

19.“Have you ever seen a dog that’s lost its master?”

The line “Have you ever seen a dog that’s lost its master?” is spoken by William Falder in John Galsworthy’s play Justice. This poignant moment occurs during a conversation with Hector Frome, the defence attorney, as Falder reflects on his emotional turmoil and sense of abandonment following his own struggles.

Falder’s comparison to a lost dog serves as a powerful metaphor for his feelings of isolation and despair. Just as a dog wander aimlessly, searching for its master, Falder feels adrift in a world that seems to have turned against him. This imagery evokes sympathy from the audience,

highlighting the deep emotional scars that accompany his actions—specifically, the forgery he committed out of desperation to help Ruth, a woman trapped in an abusive relationship.

The context of this line is crucial; it underscores Falder's vulnerability and the internal conflict he faces. He is not merely a criminal but a man grappling with profound feelings of loss and helplessness. Galsworthy uses this moment to challenge the audience's perception of justice, inviting them to consider the human emotions that drive individuals to commit acts deemed unlawful.

By likening himself to a lost dog, Falder articulates his longing for connection and understanding in a world that often punishes rather than empathizes. This line encapsulates the play's central themes of compassion and the need for a more humane approach to justice. Ultimately, it serves as a poignant reminder of the emotional complexities behind criminal behaviour and the importance of recognizing the humanity in those who are often branded as offenders.

20."I was all out of breath when I got to the bank"

The line "I was all out of breath when I got to the bank" is spoken by William Falder in John Galsworthy's play Justice. This statement occurs during a moment of reflection as Falder recounts the frantic circumstances surrounding his decision to commit forgery.

Falder's admission highlights the urgency and desperation he felt at that moment. He had rushed to the bank, driven by a sense of panic and the weight of his emotional turmoil. This urgency is not merely physical; it symbolizes the overwhelming pressure he faces in trying to help Ruth, a woman ensnared in an abusive marriage. The breathlessness he describes serves as a metaphor for the suffocating nature of his situation—caught between his moral compass and the drastic measures he feels compelled to take.

The context of this line is significant as it underscores Falder's vulnerability and the emotional stakes involved in his actions. Rather than portraying him as a cold-hearted criminal, Galsworthy presents him as a deeply troubled individual pushed to extremes by circumstance. This moment invites the audience to empathize with Falder, recognizing that his crime was born from desperation rather than malice.

Additionally, this line reflects the broader themes of the play regarding justice and compassion. Galsworthy critiques a legal system that fails to consider the human emotions and motivations behind criminal acts. By illustrating Falder's frantic state, he challenges viewers to reconsider

their perceptions of justice and punishment, advocating for a more nuanced understanding of individuals who find themselves in dire situations.

Ultimately, Falder's breathlessness encapsulates his internal struggle and the emotional weight of his actions, serving as a poignant reminder of the complexities inherent in human behaviour and the need for empathy within the framework of justice.

21."I am not able to justify to my conscience a plea for mercy which has a basis inimical to morality."

The quote "I am not able to justify to my conscience a plea for mercy which has a basis inimical to morality" is spoken by Justice Floyd, the presiding judge in the play.

Justice Floyd makes this statement during the trial of William Falder, a junior clerk who has committed forgery. The quote arises in the context of discussions about whether Falder should receive mercy in light of his circumstances, which include personal struggles and a moment of desperation that led to his crime.

Justice Floyd's statement reflects his internal conflict and the principles guiding his judicial philosophy. He suggests that while he understands the human desire for mercy, he cannot grant it if it contradicts moral law. This is particularly significant because it indicates that he believes mercy must be grounded in ethical considerations; otherwise, it risks undermining the integrity of the legal system.

Justice Floyd's suggestion serves as a critical turning point in the narrative, influencing how other characters perceive justice and mercy. His perspective contrasts sharply with characters like Walter How, who advocate for understanding Falder's plight. This dichotomy drives home Galsworthy's critique of a legal system that can be inflexible and harsh, often failing to account for human frailty.

In summary, Justice Floyd's statement serves as a poignant reflection on the complexities of justice within Galsworthy's Justice. It invites audiences to consider how legal principles intersect with moral values and the profound implications these intersections have on individuals' lives

22."I have to remember that she may have come to commit perjury on the prisoners' behalf."

The quote “I have to remember that she may have come to commit perjury on the prisoners' behalf,” is spoken by Justice Floyd in John Galsworthy's play Justice.

This quote is delivered by Justice Floyd, the presiding judge, during the trial of William Falder, who is accused of forgery. In this moment, Justice Floyd reflects on the possibility that a witness may be motivated to commit perjury out of sympathy for Falder.

His statement reveals the complexities inherent in legal proceedings, where emotions can cloud the truth. By acknowledging this potential for dishonesty, Justice Floyd emphasizes his commitment to maintaining objectivity and integrity within the courtroom. He understands that while witnesses may feel compassion for the accused, their motivations can complicate the pursuit of justice.

This quote encapsulates key themes in Justice, particularly the tension between moral considerations and legal principles. It highlights the challenges judges face in balancing empathy with their duty to uphold the law, ultimately inviting audiences to reflect on the nature of truth and justice in human affairs.

23.“Really, gentlemen, this is so peculiar a proposition that I am not disposed to weary you with further argument.”

“Really, gentlemen, this is so peculiar a proposition that I am not disposed to weary you with further argument,” is spoken by Harold Cleaver in John Galsworthy's play Justice. The quote is delivered by Harold Cleaver, the prosecution counsel, during a pivotal moment in the trial of William Falder, who is accused of forgery. Cleaver’s statement reflects his incredulity at the defense's arguments, which he finds to be both unconventional and lacking in merit. By expressing his reluctance to continue debating what he perceives as an absurd proposition, Cleaver underscores his confidence in the strength of his case and his disdain for the opposing side's attempts to defend Falder. This moment captures the adversarial nature of courtroom proceedings, where each side is determined to assert its position. Cleaver’s dismissive attitude highlights the tension that often characterizes trials, where emotions run high and stakes are significant. His remark suggests a sense of superiority and frustration, as he believes that engaging further with what he considers nonsensical arguments would be a waste of time. This dynamic reflects a broader theme within Galsworthy's play: the competitive environment of the legal system, where winning can overshadow the pursuit of true justice. The courtroom

becomes a battleground where legal representatives focus on defeating their opponents rather than seeking an equitable resolution.

Moreover, Cleaver's statement serves as a critique of the rigidity often found in legal arguments and the potential for moral ambiguity within judicial proceedings. The phrase “peculiar proposition” implies that certain legal arguments can defy common sense or ethical considerations. This highlights a critical aspect of Galsworthy’s narrative: that legal frameworks can become so entrenched in their own rules that they may overlook fundamental human truths and individual circumstances. Cleaver’s perspective raises important questions about how justice is defined and pursued within such a system. Ultimately, Galsworthy uses Cleaver’s character to illustrate how lawyers can become entrenched in their roles, prioritizing personal ambition over ethical considerations. This aspect reflects a broader critique of the legal profession, suggesting that some practitioners may focus more on winning cases than on ensuring justice for those involved. In Justice, this moment emphasizes the need for a more compassionate approach to legal proceedings—one that recognizes and addresses the complexities of human experience rather than reducing individuals to mere legal cases. Through this lens, Galsworthy invites audiences to reflect on the nature of justice itself and consider how it can be achieved amidst the complexities of human behavior and emotion.

24.“Men like the prisoner are destroyed daily under our law for want of that human insight which sees them as they are- patients, and not criminals.”

The line “Men like the prisoner are destroyed daily under our law for want of that human insight which sees them as they are—patients, and not criminals” is spoken by Hector Frome in John Galsworthy’s play Justice. This statement occurs during the trial of William Falder, who has committed forgery out of desperation to help Ruth, a woman trapped in an abusive marriage.

Frome’s remark highlights a critical flaw in the judicial system: its inability to recognize the humanity behind criminal actions. By referring to Falder and others like him as “patients,” Frome emphasizes that these individuals are often victims of circumstance rather than inherently immoral beings. This perspective challenges the audience to reconsider their views on justice and punishment, suggesting that the law should be more compassionate and understanding of human frailty.

The context of this line is significant as it underscores Galsworthy's broader critique of a legal system that prioritizes rigid adherence to rules over empathy and insight. Frome's plea for understanding reflects his belief that true justice must account for the complexities of individual situations, particularly those driven by desperation or emotional turmoil.

Ultimately, this line serves as a poignant reminder of the need for reform within the legal system. Galsworthy's portrayal of Falder's plight illustrates how societal pressures can lead individuals to commit crimes, and it calls for a more humane approach to justice—one that recognizes the underlying issues faced by those who find themselves in desperate situations. By advocating for a legal framework that sees individuals as more than just criminals, Galsworthy urges society to adopt a more compassionate stance towards those who have erred, fostering an environment where rehabilitation is prioritized over punishment.

25."If you'd seen it, having the feelings for her that I had, you'd have felt the same, I know."

In Justice by John Galsworthy, this line by William Falder reflects his profound emotional conflict and desperation. Falder, a young law clerk working in the law office of James and Walter How, has fallen deeply in love with Ruth Honeywill, a married woman who is abused by her husband. Falder's statement reveals that he feels justified in committing forgery because of the intense love and sympathy he has for Ruth. His desire to rescue her from her harsh life blinds him to the potential consequences of his crime, showing how strong emotions can cloud judgment and drive one to moral compromise.

Galsworthy uses Falder's emotional turmoil to emphasize the disconnect between the rigid structure of the law and the nuances of individual circumstances. Falder believes that if others truly understood the depth of his feelings and his compassionate motives, they would empathize with his decision. However, the court and society are indifferent to his personal plight and only see his act as a criminal offense. This conflict between personal motivation and societal law raises the question of whether justice should be purely objective or if it should consider individual circumstances.

Falder's tragedy lies in the fact that the judicial system disregards his emotions and intentions, focusing solely on his actions. Galsworthy uses this to criticize a system that is unable to account for human vulnerability and complex emotional motivations. Falder's words highlight a central theme of the play: that rigid justice can be both inhumane and unjust when it fails to

consider compassion, empathy, and the personal motives behind actions. His story serves as a poignant critique of how the legal system often fails to recognize the humanity of those it punishes.

26.“I don’t see why I should, sir, not to be a man like that.”

In this line, Cokeson, the office manager in Justice, expresses his frustration and moral discomfort toward a character he finds unworthy of respect. Cokeson is a compassionate yet rule-abiding man who manages the law office where William Falder works. Though he is initially shocked by Falder’s forgery, he grows sympathetic towards him, recognizing the young clerk's tragic circumstances and emotional vulnerability. His remark is likely directed towards Mr. James How, one of the partners in the firm, who represents the rigid and impersonal side of the legal profession.

Cokeson’s words reveal his inner conflict with the unyielding and often harsh attitudes of those in power, like Mr. James. Cokeson has a strong sense of fairness and believes in giving people a second chance. Throughout the play, he becomes one of Falder’s few allies, advocating for understanding and empathy rather than strict punishment. However, Mr. James is depicted as a figure who values the law above personal compassion, illustrating the stark contrast between humanity and the law. This line highlights Cokeson's struggle with a system that does not align with his moral convictions.

Galsworthy uses Cokeson’s perspective to criticize a judicial and professional system that often overlooks individual morality in favor of unwavering adherence to rules. Cokeson’s words are a subtle act of rebellion, as he questions why he should respect a person who, in his view, lacks compassion. Through Cokeson, Galsworthy raises important questions about the conflict between personal ethics and societal expectations. This line underscores the tension between Cokeson's compassion and the law’s demand for impartiality, showing how individuals within the system may experience inner turmoil when their values are at odds with institutional principles.

27.“You must not allow any consideration of age or temptation to weigh with you in the findings of your verdict.”

In Justice by John Galsworthy, the statement, “You must not allow any consideration of age or temptation to weigh with you in the findings of your verdict,” is delivered by the Judge during

William Falder's trial. This line underscores the judicial philosophy of strict impartiality, where personal circumstances such as youth or vulnerability to temptation are deemed irrelevant in determining guilt. The Judge is instructing the jury to focus solely on the legality of Falder's actions—namely, his forgery—and to disregard any emotional or empathetic considerations.

Falder's case, however, is deeply entwined with factors of age, temptation, and desperation. A young clerk with limited means, Falder is driven to commit forgery out of love and compassion for Ruth Honeywill, a woman trapped in an abusive marriage. His actions are not motivated by personal gain or malice but rather by a sincere, albeit misguided, desire to rescue Ruth. Galsworthy uses the Judge's instructions to the jury to illustrate the tragic rigidity of the legal system, which dismisses the complex motives behind human actions in favor of an unemotional, absolute verdict.

This line highlights one of the central themes of Justice: the conflict between the letter of the law and the broader principles of humanity and compassion. By asking the jury to ignore Falder's circumstances, the Judge implies that justice should be blind to individual context. Galsworthy critiques this approach, suggesting that a legal system unwilling to consider human factors risks perpetuating injustice rather than preventing it. Falder's story becomes emblematic of the suffering caused by a system that prioritizes objective punishment over understanding. In this line, Galsworthy questions whether true justice can be achieved if it fails to account for the humanity of those it judges, illustrating how rigid laws can trap individuals in cycles of despair and hopelessness.

28.“I shouldn’t like you to have led me to the answer.”

In Justice by John Galsworthy, the line, “I shouldn’t like you to have led me to the answer,” is spoken by Cokeson, the well-meaning but somewhat narrow-minded office manager at the law firm where William Falder works. This statement is directed toward the defense lawyer, as Cokeson testifies in Falder's forgery trial. Cokeson, who has a strong sense of honesty and duty, does not want to appear as though he’s been influenced or manipulated into giving a particular response in his testimony. His words reveal his desire to maintain integrity and avoid appearing biased or swayed by any party in the courtroom.

Cokeson's statement highlights his ethical stance and his commitment to truth, even as he struggles with conflicting loyalties. While he sympathizes with Falder, he is also bound by his sense of duty to the law and the firm. By stating that he doesn’t want to be "led," Cokeson

emphasizes his wish to remain impartial and truthful, despite his underlying compassion for Falder's plight. He represents the human element within the otherwise cold, bureaucratic world of law—a man who desires to do right by the rules but is uncomfortable with the rigidity and lack of empathy in the judicial process.

Galsworthy uses Cokeson's reluctance to be "led" as a way to critique how individuals within the legal system are often constrained by its rules and conventions, which may prevent them from fully expressing empathy or advocating for humane treatment. This line underlines Cokeson's internal struggle and the play's broader theme: the tension between justice as an abstract ideal and the moral realities of individuals within the system. Cokeson's insistence on speaking freely and honestly reflects his discomfort with a system that may pressure witnesses to conform to a particular narrative, raising questions about the integrity of a legal process that demands objectivity at the cost of compassion.

29."Is he to become a member of the luckless crews that man those dark ill-starred ships called prisons?"

In Justice by John Galsworthy, the line "Is he to become a member of the luckless crews that man those dark ill-starred ships called prisons?" is spoken by William Falder's defense lawyer during his trial. This powerful metaphor vividly captures the grim reality of the prison system and the irreversible impact it has on individuals who, like Falder, find themselves caught in desperate circumstances. The lawyer pleads with the court, highlighting the harsh and dehumanizing nature of imprisonment, especially for someone as young and vulnerable as Falder, who is not a hardened criminal but a man driven by compassion and love for Ruth Honeywill.

In comparing prisons to "dark ill-starred ships," the lawyer evokes the imagery of condemned souls or "luckless crews," trapped in a life of suffering and isolation. This metaphor suggests that the prison system is like a doomed vessel, casting its inhabitants into despair rather than offering them redemption or rehabilitation. The lawyer's appeal emphasizes the play's central critique of the justice system: its failure to account for individual circumstances and its tendency to punish rather than to understand or reform.

Galsworthy uses this line to draw attention to the harshness of the British penal system, which offers little hope for those who enter it. Through the lawyer's words, he questions whether the court truly serves justice by condemning people like Falder, whose crime stems not from malice

but from love and desperation. The line underscores the broader social critique in Justice, where Galsworthy advocates for a more humane and compassionate approach to justice—one that recognizes the personal stories behind each case rather than reducing individuals to mere criminals. This plea reflects the tragic irony of Falder's situation: though he seeks to escape hardship, his actions may doom him to a life of suffering within the very "ill-starred ship" of the prison system, highlighting the play's underlying call for reform and empathy in the judicial process.

30."It couldn't have been four minutes, Sir, because I ran all the way."

In Justice by John Galsworthy, the line "It couldn't have been four minutes, Sir, because I ran all the way," is spoken by William Falder during his trial for forgery. Falder, a young law clerk, tries to defend himself by explaining the brief time he had to commit the crime. This statement captures Falder's desperation and his attempt to mitigate his guilt by stressing the hurried, impulsive nature of his actions. His words convey a sense of panic, as he tries to justify the briefness of the act to show that he had little premeditation.

Falder's statement reflects his character as a young, vulnerable individual who is overwhelmed by his circumstances. He committed forgery not out of greed, but out of love and concern for Ruth Honeywill, a woman he wishes to help escape an abusive marriage. Galsworthy uses this moment to underscore the theme of human vulnerability within a rigid legal system that disregards individual motives. Despite his explanation, Falder's attempt to provide context is overshadowed by the strict, unforgiving nature of the court, which focuses only on the legality of his actions rather than the motives behind them.

Through this line, Galsworthy emphasizes how the justice system fails to consider the emotional and situational factors that drive individuals to commit crimes. Falder's plea—stating that he "ran all the way"—is his effort to communicate that his actions were rushed, possibly even impulsive, and not calculated. However, the court's focus remains on the act itself rather than the context, illustrating Galsworthy's critique of a system that lacks empathy. This line represents Falder's tragic struggle to make the court see him as a human being with genuine, compassionate motives, rather than reducing him to just another criminal. This adds to the play's larger message on the need for a justice system that not only punishes but also understands the human dimensions of those it judges.

31.“He told me afterwards he’d come into a windfall.”

In Justice by John Galsworthy, the line “He told me afterwards he’d come into a windfall” is likely spoken by a witness or character recounting William Falder's attempt to justify his sudden possession of extra money after committing forgery. This statement serves to illustrate how Falder tried to cover up his actions by fabricating a story about unexpectedly receiving money. His claim of a “windfall” is meant to deflect suspicion and downplay any connection to his crime, reflecting his nervousness and desperation to avoid punishment.

Falder’s fabricated story about the windfall underscores his fear of being caught, as well as his lack of experience in handling such a stressful situation. Galsworthy uses this line to reveal the lengths to which Falder goes to protect himself and his fragile dream of helping Ruth Honeywill, the woman he loves. Falder’s crime of forgery was not driven by greed, but rather by his compassionate desire to assist Ruth in escaping an abusive marriage. However, when questioned about his sudden access to money, he resorts to a lie, indicating his desperate state and inability to foresee the consequences of his actions.

This line also reflects one of the play’s central themes: the tragic consequences of impulsive actions taken by individuals in desperate circumstances. Galsworthy portrays Falder as a sympathetic figure, a young man driven to dishonesty and crime by a society that offers him no other escape from his predicament. The mention of a “windfall” represents Falder’s fleeting hope that he could evade responsibility, but it ultimately contributes to his downfall, as the lie is easily exposed. Galsworthy uses Falder’s futile deception to critique a legal system that is quick to condemn but slow to understand the social and personal factors that lead people to crime, highlighting the need for compassion within justice.

32.“She has every reason to favour the prisoner- She said the prisoner was not insane.”

In Justice by John Galsworthy, the line “She has every reason to favour the prisoner – She said the prisoner was not insane” likely refers to a moment in the trial where the defense attempts to question the credibility of a witness, or the prosecution argues against any suggestion of Falder’s mental instability. This statement reflects the way the legal system scrutinizes and questions each piece of testimony, especially when it appears to support the accused. Here, “She” could be Ruth Honeywill or another character with a personal connection to Falder, whose support for him might be seen as biased by the court.

The line highlights the complexities of witness testimony and how the justice system evaluates the motives behind statements given in favor of the defendant. Galsworthy illustrates the tendency of the court to dismiss testimony from those who may be sympathetic toward the accused, suggesting a skeptical view of emotional connections that could compromise "objectivity." In Falder's case, Ruth, as the woman he loves and for whom he committed the crime, is naturally inclined to support him, leading the court to question her reliability. The legal system, therefore, prioritizes detachment and impartiality, even if it means disregarding the emotional truths that could provide insight into Falder's motives and state of mind.

The assertion that Falder "was not insane" also underscores a crucial aspect of his defense, as Falder's actions could be seen as the result of a momentary lapse or emotional turmoil rather than a deliberate, calculated crime. By dismissing the possibility of mental instability, the court reinforces its rigid view that Falder is solely responsible for his actions. Galsworthy uses this line to critique a justice system that fails to account for the complex human elements—such as love, desperation, and psychological strain—that drive individuals to commit crimes. This approach leads to a more severe outcome for Falder, as the court disregards the emotional struggles underlying his actions, ultimately reflecting the play's theme of the legal system's lack of empathy.

33."The rest has followed as death follows a stab to the heart...."

In *Justice* by John Galsworthy, the quote "The rest has followed as death follows a stab to the heart" vividly encapsulates the inevitability and speed of the consequences stemming from a single moral lapse. Delivered as part of Mr. Frome's closing argument, the line underscores the chain reaction triggered by William Falder's act of forgery, which ultimately seals his tragic downfall. Falder's crime, committed in a moment of emotional turmoil over Ruth Honeywill's plight, leads to irreversible legal repercussions, highlighting the play's themes of human fragility, justice, and systemic rigidity.

The metaphor likens the aftermath of Falder's actions to death following a mortal wound, emphasizing the fatalistic nature of his situation. Just as a stab irrevocably wounds the body, Falder's forgery irreparably damages his life and reputation. This imagery not only conveys the inevitability of his fate but also critiques the rigid and unempathetic nature of the justice system, which fails to distinguish between crimes of malice and those born of desperation.

The quote reflects Falder's psychological state, portraying him as a tragic figure overwhelmed by his circumstances. His sense of hopelessness and torment mirrors the play's broader criticism of a legal framework that punishes rather than rehabilitates. By depicting Falder as a victim of emotional distress rather than a hardened criminal, Galsworthy questions whether the law, in its current form, truly serves justice.

Ultimately, the line symbolizes the play's central conflict between rigid legality and human compassion. It calls for an acknowledgment of human weakness and the necessity of mercy within the legal system, urging a reflection on the need for reform to prevent individuals like Falder from being destroyed by their errors.

34."Anyway, when I got outside, I wanted to chuck myself under a bus."

In *Justice* by John Galsworthy, the line "Anyway, when I got outside, I wanted to chuck myself under a bus" captures William Falder's intense psychological turmoil and regret immediately after committing forgery. Spoken during his testimony, it reveals the overwhelming guilt that consumes him as he reflects on his impulsive action to secure money for an escape with Ruth Honeywill. Falder's remorse is palpable, as he derives no relief or satisfaction from his crime, only the crushing realization of its moral and legal consequences. His desire to harm himself highlights the inner conflict between his love for Ruth and his awareness of the wrongdoing, underscoring his fragile emotional state.

Galsworthy uses this moment to delve deeply into Falder's psyche, portraying him as a victim of circumstance rather than a true criminal. Ruth's suffering, coupled with Falder's desperation to save her, leaves him unable to think rationally, and his fragile mental state drives his impulsive decision. The metaphor of throwing himself under a bus further emphasizes his hopelessness and foreshadows his inevitable downfall, as his life is figuratively "run over" by the harsh and unforgiving justice system.

This line also serves as a critique of society's inability to support individuals like Falder. His desperation stems from the lack of legal or societal avenues to assist Ruth, forcing him into a moral and legal misstep. Falder's predicament highlights the inadequacies of the justice system in addressing human vulnerabilities, illustrating how individuals in distress are often left without options.

In essence, the line encapsulates Falder's humanity and vulnerability, presenting him as a tragic figure ensnared by love and societal constraints. It underscores the play's critique of an inflexible justice system and its devastating impact on those who act out of emotional desperation rather than malice.

35."The offence with which the prisoner is charged is one of the most serious known to our law."

In *Justice* by John Galsworthy, the prosecution's statement during Falder's trial emphasizes the gravity of forgery as a crime that breaches trust and undermines societal stability. By portraying Falder's actions as deliberate and deserving of severe punishment, the prosecutor frames forgery as a public concern rather than an individual failing. However, this rigid legal perspective contrasts with the defence's argument that Falder acted impulsively and out of emotional distress rather than malice. This tension highlights the central theme of the play: the conflict between the inflexible application of legal codes and the complexities of human frailty.

Through this statement, Galsworthy critiques the justice system's failure to account for the circumstances and intentions behind crimes. While Falder's act technically violates the law, it lacks the calculated malice that typically defines severe offenses, raising moral questions about whether the system adequately considers the vulnerabilities and desperation of individuals. Falder's attempt to save Ruth Honeywill, born from a moment of emotional turmoil, sharply contrasts with the prosecutor's depiction of him as a dangerous criminal, further challenging the fairness of such judgments.

Ultimately, this remark underscores the harshness of a system that treats all offenders with equal severity, regardless of their intent or context. Galsworthy invites the audience to question the justice system's rigidity and to consider the need for empathy and understanding in addressing crimes driven by human weakness rather than true criminality.

36."Gentlemen, men like the prisoner are destroyed daily under our law for want of that human insight which sees them as they are, patients and not criminals".

In *Justice* by John Galsworthy, this statement is made by Mr. Frome, Falder's defence counsel, during his closing arguments as he appeals to the jury's compassion. Frome argues that Falder's actions were driven by emotional and psychological distress rather than inherent criminality,

portraying him as a victim of circumstances. Falder's impulsive act of forgery is depicted not as a calculated crime but as an act of desperation, making him more akin to a "patient" in need of understanding than a true criminal.

The statement critiques the rigidity of the justice system, which often disregards the context and motivation behind crimes. Galsworthy uses this argument to highlight how the system perpetuates the downfall of vulnerable individuals by treating them as irredeemable instead of offering opportunities for rehabilitation. Frome's defence resonates with the play's broader themes of justice and humanity, emphasizing the urgent need for reforms that differentiate between premeditated offenses and those born of emotional distress.

By framing Falder as a "patient," Frome advocates for a more compassionate approach to justice, one that prioritizes rehabilitation over punishment. This perspective challenges the audience to question the true purpose of justice and whether it should focus solely on retribution or strive to address the complexities of human behaviour.

Ultimately, the statement encapsulates Galsworthy's critique of the legal system's lack of humanity. It urges a reconsideration of how justice is administered and calls for a system that recognizes and addresses the vulnerabilities and emotional struggles that often underlie human actions.

37."He was kind of everywhere at once with his eyes"

In *Justice* by John Galsworthy, the line "He was kind of everywhere at once with his eyes" is spoken by Robert Cokeson during Falder's trial, describing Falder's nervous demeanour on the morning he committed the forgery. This observation portrays Falder as anxious and unsettled, reflecting his internal turmoil and lack of control over his emotions.

The description highlights Falder's psychological state, suggesting that he was overwhelmed by his emotions rather than deliberately planning a crime. His inability to focus and the erratic movement of his eyes symbolize his mental unrest, mirroring his disoriented thought process and the impulsive nature of his decision-making.

Cokeson's observation supports the defence's argument that Falder's actions were not driven by criminal intent but by a moment of emotional instability or temporary insanity. This aligns

with the play's theme of human fragility under stress, where emotional turmoil leads to impulsive actions.

Through Cokeson's testimony, Galsworthy critiques the justice system's failure to consider the psychological and emotional factors behind a crime. Falder's nervous behaviour demonstrates the emotional distress that often goes unrecognized by the legal system, which focuses only on the criminal act itself, disregarding the circumstances that led to it.

Ultimately, this line captures the depth of Falder's turmoil and emphasizes the impulsive nature of his actions. It supports the defence's plea for empathy and understanding, while also critiquing a legal system that fails to take into account the emotional and psychological context in which crimes are committed.

38."You have been given fair trial and found guilty, in my opinion rightly found guilty, of forgery".

This statement is made by the judge during William Falder's sentencing in *Justice* by John Galsworthy. It marks the conclusion of the trial, where the judge affirms the fairness of the legal process and asserts that the verdict, which found Falder guilty of forgery, is justified, regardless of any mitigating circumstances surrounding his crime.

The judge's comment emphasizes the fairness of the trial and the correctness of the verdict, reinforcing the authority of the legal system. It reflects the law's focus on evidence and procedure, rather than considering the emotional or psychological context in which the crime was committed.

This statement highlights the tension between justice and morality, as Falder's crime, while legally punishable, was driven by desperation and love for Ruth, not malice. This raises questions about whether true justice has been served, as the legal system fails to take into account the personal and moral complexities surrounding the act.

Galsworthy uses the judge's impartial tone to critique the legal system's rigidity. By prioritizing legal technicalities over the context of the crime, the system ignores the emotional and social factors that led to Falder's actions. This reflects the lack of empathy within the justice system, which treats individuals like Falder as mere offenders rather than acknowledging the human vulnerabilities that influence their decisions.

The phrase also reinforces the theme of inflexible justice, where a moment of human weakness is met with severe consequences. It shows how the legal system's unyielding approach fails to offer understanding or rehabilitation, leaving Falder a victim of its strict application.

The judge's statement encapsulates the criticism of the legal system's mechanical and inflexible approach to justice. While the trial may have been "fair" in procedural terms, the outcome highlights the failure of the law to address the deeper emotional and moral complexities of the case, making Falder a casualty of its rigid system.

39."You say that on the morning of the forgery the prisoner was jumpy."

This statement is made by the counsel for the crown, Harold cleaver, during Robert Cokeson's testimony in *Justice* by John Galsworthy, where he describes Falder's nervous behaviour on the day he committed the forgery. It provides insight into Falder's emotional instability and helps support the defence's argument of temporary insanity.

The description of Falder as "jumpy" indicates his heightened anxiety and inability to concentrate, suggesting he was emotionally disturbed. This behaviour reflects the internal conflict he was experiencing, driven by his desperate need to help Ruth Honeywill escape from her abusive situation.

Cokeson's testimony aligns with the defence's claim that Falder acted impulsively, rather than with premeditation. His jumpiness suggests that the crime was not planned, but rather a result of emotional distress, emphasizing that Falder did not commit forgery out of malice, but out of an urgent and irrational need to act.

The term "jumpy" also symbolizes Falder's anxiety, which was compounded by his desperation. His inability to think clearly highlights the vulnerability of individuals under emotional pressure, which the legal system often overlooks. Cokeson's observation indirectly critiques a justice system that fails to recognize the emotional distress that influences actions, reducing a complex human experience to a legal violation.

Cokeson's statement about Falder being "jumpy" illustrates his emotional instability and supports the defence's argument for temporary insanity. It highlights the human fragility that is often disregarded by the justice system, which focuses solely on the crime itself rather than considering the emotional context in which it occurred.

QUESTION II

(10 Marks)

1. What does the trial scene reveal about Shylock? Do you think Shylock's trial was unfair?

The Trial Scene and Shylock's Character

The trial scene in Act IV of The Merchant of Venice serves as a dramatic climax that reveals the multifaceted nature of Shylock, the Jewish moneylender. Throughout the play, Shylock is depicted as a figure driven by resentment and a desire for revenge against Antonio, who has publicly insulted and mistreated him. However, the trial exposes deeper layers of his character, illuminating the themes of justice, mercy, and the societal prejudices that shape his actions.

Shylock's Motivation

At the heart of Shylock's insistence on claiming his pound of flesh lies not merely a desire for vengeance but also a profound sense of betrayal and injustice. He has been wronged by Antonio, who has undermined his business by lending money without interest, thereby devaluing Shylock's profession. This context is crucial; it frames Shylock not just as a villain but as a man who feels cornered by a society that marginalizes him. His demand for the bond is emblematic of his struggle for recognition and respect in a world that has consistently dehumanized him.

The Unfairness of the Trial

The trial itself is rife with unfairness. While Shylock seeks to enforce the law—a bond he believes to be just—he is confronted with an overwhelming bias against him. The court, presided over by Portia disguised as Balthazar, operates under a veneer of legality that masks its inherent prejudice. The moment Portia appeals to mercy, she shifts the moral ground of the trial. Her famous speech on the quality of mercy highlights the expectation that mercy should temper justice; however, this appeal does not extend to Shylock. Instead, he is met with hostility and derision.

Shylock's refusal to yield to mercy is often interpreted as stubbornness or cruelty, yet it can also be seen as an assertion of his identity and rights in a society that denies him both. When he is ultimately defeated—his wealth confiscated and his faith forced upon him—Shylock's

punishment feels disproportionate. He is not only stripped of his financial assets but also forced to convert to Christianity, erasing an essential part of his identity. This transformation from a proud Jew to a submissive Christian underscores the play's troubling engagement with themes of assimilation and loss.

In conclusion, the trial scene in The Merchant of Venice reveals Shylock as a tragic figure caught in the web of societal prejudice and personal vendetta. While he embodies the role of the antagonist, Shakespeare complicates this portrayal by inviting audiences to empathize with his plight. The unfairness of the trial reflects broader themes of justice and mercy, ultimately questioning who truly holds power in Venetian society. By examining Shylock's character through this lens, we see not just a villain but a man whose quest for justice leads him to tragic consequences—a poignant reminder of the complexities inherent in human nature and societal structures.

2. How is the trial scene, Act IV, scene I the climax of the play?

The trial scene in Act IV, Scene I of The Merchant of Venice stands as the play's climax, encapsulating its central conflicts and themes. This pivotal moment not only determines the fates of Antonio and Shylock but also crystallizes the ethical dilemmas surrounding justice and mercy.

The Dramatic Tension

As the scene unfolds in the Venetian court, we witness a palpable tension between Shylock, who demands his pound of flesh as stipulated in the bond, and Antonio, who faces imminent death. The duke's pleas for mercy fall on deaf ears as Shylock remains resolute, driven by a desire for revenge against Antonio's previous mistreatment. This confrontation highlights the deep-seated animosity that defines their relationship and sets the stage for an intense legal battle. Portia, disguised as Balthazar, enters as a beacon of hope for Antonio, yet her role complicates the narrative. She embodies both the authority of the law and the voice of compassion, navigating between Shylock's rigid adherence to justice and Antonio's plea for mercy.

The Legal and Moral Quandary

Portia's famous speech on mercy introduces a critical moral dimension to the trial. She argues that mercy is not forced but freely given, enhancing both the giver and receiver. However, Shylock's refusal to show mercy exposes a harsh reality: his demand for justice is rooted in

personal grievance rather than ethical considerations. This juxtaposition raises questions about the nature of justice itself—can it exist without compassion? As Portia cleverly reveals a loophole in Shylock's bond, stating that he may take his pound of flesh but must not spill any blood, the tables turn dramatically. Shylock's confidence crumbles as he realizes that his quest for vengeance is now fraught with impossibility.

The Turning Point

The climax reaches its zenith when Shylock is confronted with the consequences of his actions. Portia's legal acumen dismantles his case, forcing him into a position of vulnerability. The once-dominant figure now kneels before the court, stripped of power and dignity. This reversal not only serves as poetic justice but also critiques societal attitudes towards outsiders like Shylock. The trial scene becomes a microcosm of Venetian society's prejudices, illustrating how deeply ingrained biases can distort notions of justice.

Ultimately, Act IV, Scene I serves as a culmination of The Merchant of Venice's exploration of mercy versus justice. It challenges audiences to reflect on their own values while presenting a complex portrayal of Shylock—not merely as a villain but as a tragic figure ensnared by his circumstances. The climax underscores that true justice cannot exist in isolation from mercy; rather, it thrives on understanding and compassion. As Shylock exits defeated, the audience is left to ponder the implications of his downfall—a poignant reminder that in the pursuit of vengeance, one risks losing their humanity.

3. Discuss how Balthazar with his wit and intelligence could save Antonio from the danger of Shylock.

In Act IV, Scene I of The Merchant of Venice, the character of Balthazar, who is actually Portia in disguise, employs her wit and intelligence to save Antonio from Shylock's deadly demand for a pound of flesh. This scene serves as the climax of the play, showcasing not only Portia's legal acumen but also the intricate interplay between justice and mercy.

The Setup for the Climax

As the trial begins, Shylock is adamant about claiming his bond, viewing it as a matter of legal right rather than personal vendetta. Despite pleas for mercy from the Duke and Bassanio, he remains unyielding. Enter Balthazar (Portia), who has been summoned as a learned lawyer to adjudicate the case. Her initial approach is to appeal to Shylock's sense of humanity, urging

him to show mercy. However, Shylock's insistence on strict adherence to the law sets the stage for Portia's brilliant legal manoeuvring.

Exploiting Legal Technicalities

Portia's intelligence shines through when she cleverly interprets the bond. She acknowledges that Shylock is entitled to a pound of flesh but emphasizes that the contract does not permit him to shed any blood. She states:

"The words expressly are 'a pound of flesh.' But in the cutting it, if thou dost bleed, / Thou art damned."

This pivotal moment reveals a loophole in Shylock's claim: he cannot extract flesh without causing bloodshed, which would violate Venetian law. Portia's manipulation of legal language not only highlights her sharp intellect but also turns Shylock's own rigid interpretation against him.

The Shift in Power Dynamics

As Balthazar continues her argument, she escalates the stakes by declaring that Shylock's actions threaten the life of a Venetian citizen (Antonio). According to Venetian law, this act would result in severe penalties for Shylock—half his wealth would go to the state and half to Antonio. This revelation shifts the power dynamics dramatically; Shylock, once confident and vengeful, is now cornered and desperate.

Portia's strategy effectively dismantles Shylock's position while simultaneously reinforcing her own authority in the courtroom. As she turns the law against him, it becomes clear that her wit and understanding of legal intricacies are what ultimately save Antonio's life.

Conclusion: Mercy Over Justice

The trial scene culminates in a powerful moment where Portia not only saves Antonio but also forces Shylock into a position of humility and loss. By compelling Shylock to beg for mercy rather than demanding it, Portia exemplifies the play's central theme: true justice cannot exist without mercy. The cleverness with which she navigates this perilous situation highlights her as one of Shakespeare's most resourceful heroines.

In essence, Balthazar's role as Portia showcases how intelligence and wit can triumph over malice and prejudice. The trial scene thus serves not only as a dramatic climax but also as a profound commentary on human nature and societal values in The Merchant of Venice.

4. Highlight dramatic significance of the ring episode.

In William Shakespeare's The Merchant of Venice, the ring has great significance between Portia and Bassanio because it is a symbol of their love as well as their marriage. The ring episode is a minor affair in the play but it shows how our promise is broken under pressure of circumstances and when we absolutely have to do what we intended to avoid whole-heartedly.

In the play, the ring symbolizes love between Portia and Bassanio. After their marriage, Portia gives Bassanio the ring which he is requested not to part with at any circumstances. Bassanio assures her to keep the ring like a part of his body.

The ring symbolises their commitment to each other. The ring Portia and Nerissa gave to Bassanio and Gratiano that they were never to remove. The rings stand for man's commitment to his wife just as the rings that Bassanio and Gratiano would give to Portia and Nerissa at their weddings, would stand for the wives' commitment. When Portia gives the ring to Bassanio, he readily agrees to Portia's term as he loves her and doesn't think that anything would come between him keeping the ring safely on his hand. Bassanio promises Portia that when the ring leaves his finger, then his spirit will flee and his life will leave him. He will only part from the ring in death.

The ring episode makes the trial scene more interesting. In the trial scene, Portia plays the part of a young lawyer named Balthazar in the case between Shylock and Antonio (Bassanio's friend). After winning the case, she asks Bassanio for the ring as payment for saving Antonio's life. Bassanio wrestles with the decision perfectly but Portia manipulates the situation so much that he compelled to give the ring away as payment and appreciation for Antonio. Actually, Portia wants to prove how far her husband is true to his oaths. However, when Portia reaches home, she makes the whole situation clear and reinstates the ring to Bassanio and all have a pretty good laugh over it.

The ring episode of "The Merchant of Venice" is contrived to put the lovers and husbands to qualify the test of love and marriage bond. It makes the play more interesting. In fact, the ring episode has contributed a lot to the development of the plots of the play. It contains several twists and finally brings a happy ending of the play.

5. Who is better friend Antonio or Bassanio? – Discuss in regard to the trial scene of The Merchant of Venice.

Antonio is the merchant of Venice, who is very generous, particularly with his good friends. Bassanio needs money in order to woo Portia. Even though all of Antonio's money is tied up in products yet to be sold, he agrees to help Bassanio because they are such close friends. Antonio is such a loyal friend to Bassanio that he agrees to borrow money from Shylock with the stipulation that Shylock can exact a pound of flesh from Antonio if he does not repay the loan within the agreed-upon time frame.

Bassanio is more impulsive and irresponsible. And although he is loyal to Antonio, he does take advantage of his generosity; the attempt to woo Portia (and thereby inherit the vast amount of money of her estate by marrying her) is a gamble that he is willing to take with Antonio's money and the pound of flesh. However, Bassanio does reveal that he is more than a self-indulgent gambler who takes advantage of his friend. He is a very loyal friend just as Antonio is to him. He offers Shylock twice the amount he'd loaned to Antonio. Shylock refuses and then Bassanio offers to give his own flesh instead of Antonio's:

"Good cheer, Antonio! What, man, Courage yet!

The Jew shall have my flesh, blood, bones, and all,

Ere thou shalt lose for me one drop of blood!"

In the end, neither Antonio nor Bassanio are cut because a disguised Portia discovers a technicality in the agreement that no blood can be shed. In the earlier case, Bassanio needs money and Antonio helps him. In the latter case, Antonio is facing a potentially fatal injury and Bassanio offers to take his place.

The depth of their friendship is no more clearly demonstrated than in the trial scene, Act IV, scene 1. Antonio faces the distinct possibility that his failure to repay the money he borrowed from Shylock on Bassanio's behalf will result in his own death.

However, Antonio has no ill feelings whatsoever towards Bassanio for being in this unfortunate circumstance, and he's willing to accept his fate for helping his friend.

When it becomes clear that Shylock is absolutely intent on getting his "pound of flesh" from Antonio, even after trying to persuade him in every way possible, Antonio prepares to suffer his fate and offers nothing but love to Bassanio:

"Give me your hand, Bassanio. Fare you well.

Grieve not that I am fall'n to this for you,

For herein Fortune shows herself more kind

Than is her custom: it is still her use"

These exchanges between these two friends demonstrate the depth of their love and friendship for each other and the depth of the nobility of their characters. Thus, both Antonio and Bassanio are good friends to each other, it is difficult to judge them as a better friend when both value and love each other equally.

6. How does the duke try to reason with Shylock at the beginning of Act IV, Scene 1 of The Merchant of Venice? How does Shylock respond? Give details.

Scene 1 of Act IV of The Merchant of Venice takes place in a court of justice in Venice. The scene starts with the duke asking if Antonio is present and he shows his sympathy for Antonio by telling him that he pities him. He had come to defend himself against an opponent who has hard-hearted and a cruel wretch, who did not have a single grain of tenderness or sympathy in his heart.

Shylock is called a 'Stony Adversary' here because he demanded the pound of flesh from Antonio's body. This was the penalty, according to the terms of the bond, for failing to repay the three thousand ducats he had borrowed, on the specified date.

Antonio has been told that the duke had himself had used every endeavour to soften shylock severity and to call off the trial. He says that since all the duke's effort have been in vain, and Shylock remains obstinate, he is ready to suffer his cruelty with resignation. As the law is unable to deliver him from Shylock malicious hatred, he is resolved to meet his utmost fury with calmness and fortitude, and is ready to submit to the judgement of the court.

The duke makes a last-minute attempt to make Shylock show mercy on Antonio. He tells Shylock that it is everyone's opinion, and his also, that he only intends to keep up this show of severity and hatred until the last stage of the case. Then, it is believed, he will suddenly relent and show kindness and pity, which will be more wonderful and amazing than his present appearance of unrelenting malice. People say that although Shylock is now claiming the penalty, which is a pound of flesh of Antonio, the unfortunate merchant, he will let him off this payment. He will be influenced by human tenderness and sympathy for the losses Antonio has suffered, so he will generously forgive him part of the money debt, of the principal sum of three

thousand ducats. His losses have been so heavy, and have come so thick and fast upon him lately, that they have built enough to ruin even a merchant prince such as he is. They are enough to draw pity and sympathy for his condition, from hearts as hard as brass and stone, and even from savage Turks and Tartars who have never been schooled in acts of kindness and love. The duke then tells Shylock that everyone hopes he will give a sympathetic reply to his appeal.

Shylock in reply says that he has already informed the duke of his intentions and moreover, he has taken an oath, by his holy Sabbath, to see that the term of the forfeit is carried out.

Shylock threatens the duke by saying that if he refuses to let the law be carried out, then the reputation of his city will suffer. The duke has to be prepared to face the danger of losing the very liberty of his state, by leading to a revocation of the Imperial Charter which gives it. By saying 'I'll not answer that', Shylock here means that the law does not require him to answer the duke's question about why he would rather have a pound of rotten flesh than the money. He has a fancy for it, that should satisfy him.

In order to gratify his own malignity, he goes on to answer the duke's question with such answers that he knows will aggravate his pain. He goes on to state that he has individual whims like other men. He says suppose his house is infested with rats, he may spend ten thousand ducats to have them poisoned. There are some people who cannot tolerate the sight of an open-mouthed roasted pig. Some people are sent almost frantic by the sight of a cat. Still others feel infuriated to hear the screams of the bag-pipe. In all these cases, there is no definite reason for hating these things. It is just a matter of personal taste. What we like or dislike is not determined by any reason but just by a strong whim or mood, which can overpower our reason.

He continues saying that these people have no well-grounded reason to offer as to why they dislike these various objects, like a gaping pig, a harmless domestic cat and a bag-pipe wrapped in wool. These people stoop low by offending others because they cannot help giving expression to the dislike they feel. In the same way, says Shylock he can offer the duke no explanation. He will not try to give any more reason than this fact, that he bears just such a deep-rooted hatred and a definite dislike for Antonio. This influences him so greatly that he even prefers to prosecute this case against him, although he loses the money by doing so.

7. Explain in detail Gratiano's reference to Pythagoras in his heated dispute with Shylock.

Gratiano's reference to Pythagoras occurs in *The Merchant of Venice* (Act IV, Scene 1), during the courtroom scene where Shylock demands justice and Antonio's pound of flesh. Gratiano, one of Antonio's friends, uses the reference to insult and ridicule Shylock, reflecting his disdain for Shylock's perceived cruelty and obsession with vengeance.

Gratiano invokes Pythagoras, the ancient Greek philosopher known for his belief in the transmigration of souls (metempsychosis), to suggest that Shylock's merciless nature stems from the soul of a wolf. Gratiano claims that according to Pythagoras, the soul of a wolf that killed out of greed and cruelty may have passed into Shylock's body. This idea is meant to degrade Shylock, implying that he is inherently evil and incapable of mercy, like the wolf. The specific lines Gratiano speaks are:

" Thy currish spirit
Governed a wolf, who hanged for human slaughter,
Even from the gallows did his fell soul fleet,
And whilst thou layest in thy unhallowed dam,
Infused itself in thee; for thy desires
Are wolfish, bloody, starved, and ravenous."

Gratiano's words aim to dehumanize Shylock by likening him to a predatory animal, portraying him as consumed by vengeance and devoid of human compassion.

8. Write a note on the famous 'Mercy Speech' delivered by Portia in Act IV Scene i of The Merchant of Venice. What does it reveal about Portia's character?

Portia's "Mercy Speech" in Act IV, Scene 1 of William Shakespeare's The Merchant of Venice is one of the play's most celebrated passages. Delivered in the climactic courtroom scene, Portia, disguised as a male lawyer, appeals to Shylock's sense of morality, urging him to show mercy to Antonio, who faces the grim penalty of losing a pound of flesh as per their bond. Through her eloquent plea, Portia presents mercy as a divine and noble quality that transcends the rigidity of human law, embodying Shakespeare's exploration of justice, compassion, and human frailty.

Portia opens her speech with the famous lines:

"The quality of mercy is not strained; It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven."

By comparing mercy to gentle rain, which nourishes the earth freely and without compulsion, she emphasizes its natural, effortless grace. This metaphor captures the essence of mercy as a spontaneous act of goodness, essential for nurturing harmony in human relationships. Portia's view of mercy as an unforced and life-giving virtue reflects her wisdom and deep understanding of human nature.

She continues by describing mercy as

"Twice blessed: It blesseth him that gives and him that takes."

This line underscores the reciprocal and redemptive nature of mercy, showing that it enriches both the giver and the recipient. In highlighting this dual benefit, Portia positions mercy as a higher moral choice, transcending the limitations of strict legal rights. Her words appeal not only to Shylock's reason but also to his humanity, urging him to temper his pursuit of justice with compassion.

Portia further elevates mercy to a divine level, stating that it is "an attribute to God himself" and that earthly power becomes godlike when tempered with mercy. By aligning mercy with divine qualities, she subtly encourages Shylock to emulate the higher virtues of forgiveness and compassion rather than clinging to vengeance. She also argues that if God were to judge humanity with pure justice, none would find salvation:

"In the course of justice, none of us should see salvation: We do pray for mercy."

This powerful statement serves as a reminder that mercy is integral to forgiveness and redemption, qualities that lie at the heart of a just and moral society. In making this point, Portia not only appeals to Shylock's sense of spirituality but also underscores the limitations of rigid justice.

Portia's speech is a masterclass in rhetoric. Her poetic language combines logic and emotion, allowing her to engage both the intellect and the conscience of her audience. Her gentle tone and carefully structured arguments showcase her exceptional skill in persuasion, as she crafts a case for mercy that is as moving as it is rational. Moreover, her ability to present such a compelling argument while disguised as a man in a male-dominated courtroom highlights her intelligence, adaptability, and confidence.

Strategically, Portia's speech also sets the stage for her later legal maneuver. By emphasizing the importance of mercy over strict adherence to the law, she prepares the court to question the

justice of Shylock's demands. Her argument not only seeks to save Antonio but also serves to expose the flaws in Shylock's rigid pursuit of his bond, making her eventual legal counterstrike all the more impactful. This blend of compassion and shrewdness reflects her dual role as both an advocate for higher virtues and a keen legal mind.

However, while Portia's speech is celebrated for its eloquence and moral insight, its effectiveness is complicated by the broader context of the play. The Christian characters, who extol mercy, often fail to practice it themselves, particularly in their treatment of Shylock after his defeat. This irony underscores Shakespeare's nuanced exploration of justice and mercy, revealing the complexities and hypocrisies of human behaviour.

Ultimately, Portia's speech is a timeless commentary on the balance between law and compassion. Through her eloquence, wisdom, and moral conviction, she emerges as one of the play's most compelling characters, embodying the ideals of mercy and justice that resonate across centuries.

9. Bring out the dramatic qualities of the 'Trial Scene' (Act IV, sc. i) of The Merchant of Venice.

The *Trial Scene* (Act IV, Scene 1) of *The Merchant of Venice* is the dramatic climax of the play. It masterfully combines themes of justice, mercy, and revenge while showcasing Shakespeare's skill in creating tension, irony, and resolution.

The scene opens with an intense atmosphere as Shylock stands resolute in his demand for a pound of Antonio's flesh, representing the rigid enforcement of the bond. Antonio, resigned to his fate, and the pleas of the duke and others for mercy heighten the stakes. The courtroom setting adds to the formality and gravity of the situation, emphasizing the life-and-death stakes.

Characterization and Emotional Depth:

- Shylock: Shylock's implacable demand for justice and his refusal to show mercy reveal his deep resentment toward the Christians, rooted in personal and societal grievances. His character elicits both fear and pity.
- Antonio: Antonio's stoic acceptance of his fate reflects his noble character, contrasting with Shylock's intensity.

- Portia: Disguised as the learned lawyer "Balthazar," Portia's intelligence and poise dominate the scene, showcasing her as a figure of wit and justice.

The dramatic tension hinges on the clash between Shylock's demand for justice and Portia's appeal for mercy. The famous *"The quality of mercy"* speech is central, presenting the moral and philosophical arguments for compassion.

The turning point comes when Portia, after allowing Shylock to push the case to its limit, cleverly uses the letter of the law against him. Her revelation that Shylock may take only the flesh and not spill any blood is both shocking and satisfying.

While Antonio is saved, Shylock's fate—a forced conversion to Christianity and loss of his wealth—leaves the audience questioning the Christian characters' mercy. This moral ambiguity adds depth to the scene.

The scene is marked by eloquent speeches, especially Portia's *"The quality of mercy"* and Shylock's passionate rhetoric about the sanctity of the bond, which reveal the characters' inner conflicts and values. The *Trial Scene* captivates through its high stakes, dramatic reversals, and exploration of profound moral themes. It is a dramatic tour de force that combines courtroom tension with ethical debate, leaving a lasting impression on audiences

10. Can you defend the conversion of Shylock to Christianity? Give reasons for your answer.

Defending Shylock's forced conversion to Christianity in the play 'The Merchant of Venice' is challenging, as it raises significant ethical, religious, and cultural issues. However, we can examine a few arguments within the context of the play, though these points remain contentious and are often viewed critically by modern audiences.

1. **Social and Legal Context of the Play:**

In the setting of The Merchant of Venice, Venetian society is predominantly Christian, and anti-Semitic sentiments are common. Shylock's forced conversion can be seen as a means of assimilating him into this society. At that time, conversion was viewed as a way to "save" non-Christians, an idea that the society might have believed to be morally justified, even if it was a form of cultural domination. From this perspective, the forced conversion reflects the era's narrow view of religious tolerance.

2. **Mercy in Legal Punishment**:

Portia, in her defense of Antonio, uses strict interpretations of the law to turn the trial against Shylock. The duke then spares Shylock's life but imposes the conditions of conversion and confiscation of his property. The Venetian court views these terms as more merciful than the death penalty, considering it a compromise that saves Shylock's life and places him under Christian protection, giving him some measure of forgiveness within their worldview.

3. **Character Transformation:**

One interpretation of the play is that Shakespeare might have intended for Shylock's conversion to symbolize a form of personal redemption or transformation. While Shylock's forced conversion is ultimately tragic, it could be seen as a way for him to release his attachment to vengeance and embrace a new identity, even if unwillingly. This view is tenuous, as it assumes that Shylock benefits in some way from the conversion, but it's worth noting that Shakespeare's contemporaries may have interpreted it as a moral "victory" of forgiveness over revenge.

4. **Reinforcement of Christian Values:**

The play often juxtaposes Christian values of mercy and forgiveness with Shylock's perceived adherence to justice and vengeance. In Elizabethan England, audiences may have viewed Shylock's conversion as an ultimate acceptance of mercy and the values that Christianity espouses. His conversion could then be interpreted as aligning with the play's themes of mercy, implying that Shylock has symbolically, though controversially, been "redeemed" through this act.

However, these defenses do not fully justify the forced conversion by modern ethical standards, as it strips Shylock of his religious identity and personal freedom. Today, this moment is often viewed as a tragic end to Shylock's story, underscoring the intolerance and prejudices of the society around him rather than his genuine transformation. In this light, Shylock's conversion may be interpreted as a critique by Shakespeare of the injustices faced by marginalized individuals, rather than a justified punishment.

11. Summarize the contents of the letter of introduction that Bellario wrote to the Duke for Balthazar.

In 'The Merchant of Venice', Dr. Bellario, a respected lawyer from Padua, writes a significant letter of introduction to the Duke of Venice on behalf of Balthazar (who is actually Portia in

disguise). The letter serves multiple purposes: it explains Bellario's own absence from the court due to illness, recommends Balthazar as a skilled legal representative, and provides assurances of Balthazar's capability to handle the case. Through this letter, Bellario effectively grants Portia the authority to argue the case in his place.

The letter begins with Bellario expressing regret that he cannot attend the trial himself due to illness. This explanation serves as both a polite apology and an acknowledgment of the duke's need for assistance with the complex legal matters in Antonio's case. By addressing his illness, Bellario prepares the duke for his absence and suggests that his decision to send Balthazar (Portia) is made in good faith and with respect for the court's need for competent counsel.

Bellario goes on to offer a strong endorsement of Balthazar's legal expertise and skills, building the duke's confidence in his abilities. Bellario praises Balthazar's deep understanding of law and his capacity to handle a case as challenging as the one between Shylock and Antonio. By highlighting Balthazar's qualifications, Bellario conveys that this young lawyer, though not widely known to the court, possesses the wisdom and insight necessary to navigate the legal intricacies involved. This endorsement effectively establishes Portia's (in her disguise as Balthazar) credibility before she even begins her argument, ensuring that the duke and other members of the court view her with trust and respect.

In addition to vouching for Balthazar's competence, Bellario also mentions that he has provided him with his own legal notes on the case. This gesture further strengthens Balthazar's position by indicating that he not only has Bellario's trust but also has access to the legal insights and opinions of a seasoned expert. The duke and the court are likely reassured by this, as it means that Balthazar will be arguing with both his own knowledge and the benefit of Bellario's wisdom. This detail demonstrates Bellario's commitment to supporting the duke and the court, even in his absence, and solidifies Balthazar's credibility.

Bellario's letter ultimately achieves several important outcomes. First, it explains his absence in a respectful manner, showing that he does not intend to neglect his duties but is unable to attend due to unavoidable health issues. Second, it establishes Balthazar as a trustworthy and skilled representative, capable of handling the complex trial. Finally, it serves as a strategic device in the play, setting the stage for Portia's intervention in Antonio's trial by giving her, in disguise as Balthazar, the authority to speak on Bellario's behalf.

In summary, Bellario's letter is a well-crafted piece of writing that accomplishes its purpose of preparing the duke and the court to receive Balthazar as an equal replacement. It is through

Bellario's strong recommendation and assurances that Portia, disguised as Balthazar, is able to step into the trial with the credibility and respect necessary to influence the outcome. The letter provides a seamless introduction for Portia's entrance into the courtroom, setting the foundation for her to advocate effectively for Antonio and ultimately turn the case in his favor.

12. What punishment is there in Venice for one who "seeks the life of any citizen"? How does Antonio modify this punishment?

In Act IV Scene I of 'The Merchant of Venice,' Portia highlights the severe consequences for anyone who seeks to harm a citizen of Venice. According to Venetian law, if an alien is proven to have attempted to take the life of a citizen, they face significant penalties. Half of their goods are seized, with the other half going to the state's treasury, and their life is left to the mercy of the duke. This legal framework underscores the seriousness with which Venice treats threats against its citizens, reflecting a society that prioritizes the protection of its people.

Portia's argument against Shylock is based on his actions towards Antonio, asserting that Shylock has plotted against Antonio's life. She presents compelling evidence of Shylock's intent to harm Antonio, thereby placing him in the precarious position defined by the law. Portia also calls upon Shylock to seek mercy from the duke, suggesting that his actions have led him to a grave consequence where he must face judgment for his intentions.

Antonio proposes to modify the punishment imposed on Shylock by suggesting a more lenient outcome. He asks the duke to allow Shylock to forfeit only half of his goods instead of facing the full repercussions of his actions. Antonio expresses his willingness to accept half of Shylock's wealth, with the condition that the other half is used for charitable purposes. Specifically, he desires that upon Shylock's death, the remaining half of his goods be given to the gentleman who recently eloped with Shylock's daughter.

Additionally, Antonio stipulates two critical conditions for this arrangement. First, he requests that Shylock convert to Christianity, which not only signifies a personal transformation but also reflects the religious tensions present in the play. Second, Antonio insists that Shylock formally record a gift of all his possessions to his daughter Jessica and her husband Lorenzo.

This proposal demonstrates Antonio's capacity for forgiveness and his desire to redirect Shylock's potential punishment towards a more constructive end.

13. Would you agree that Antonio is the pivotal character of "The Merchant of Venice"? Explain your opinion in detail.

Yes, I would agree that Antonio is the pivotal character of *The Merchant of Venice*. His actions, relationships, and character traits drive the plot and significantly influence the events that unfold throughout the play.

Firstly, Antonio's role as a successful merchant establishes the initial premise of the story. His decision to help his friend Bassanio by securing a loan from Shylock sets off a chain of events that ultimately leads to the dramatic trial. This act of friendship demonstrates his loyalty and generosity, which are central to his character. Despite his financial constraints, Antonio's willingness to assist Bassanio highlights his importance in the narrative.

Secondly, Antonio's interactions with Shylock reveal the themes of mercy, justice, and revenge that permeate the play. His acceptance of the bond, which includes the risk of losing a pound of flesh, showcases his bravery but also his naivety regarding Shylock's vengeful nature. This bond becomes the focal point of the conflict and the trial that follows, making Antonio's predicament crucial to the plot's progression.

Moreover, Antonio's character embodies a contrasting perspective to Shylock's. While Shylock represents vindictiveness and strict adherence to the law, Antonio reflects values of mercy and honor. His reluctance to engage in conflict with Shylock and his desire for a straightforward resolution to the bond underscore his moral integrity.

Antonio's relationships with other characters, particularly Bassanio and Portia, also contribute to his pivotal role. His deep affection for Bassanio and his acceptance of his fate illustrate the themes of love and friendship that are woven throughout the play. Furthermore, Portia's actions in the courtroom hinge upon Antonio's situation, as she devises a plan to save him, thereby highlighting his significance in the resolution of the plot.

In conclusion, Antonio's character serves as the backbone of *The Merchant of Venice*. His decisions and experiences not only propel the narrative forward but also embody the play's central themes. Thus, it is evident that Antonio is indeed the pivotal character in this Shakespearean drama.

14. Antonio is the pivotal character of 'The Merchant of Venice'. Justify

Antonio is the pivotal character in ‘The Merchant of Venice’ due to his integral role in the development of the plot. His actions and relationships set the stage for the unfolding drama, making him central to both the narrative and its moral explorations.

Firstly, Antonio's financial predicament is the catalyst for the entire plot. His decision to help his friend Bassanio, despite his own lack of funds, leads to the crucial bond with Shylock. This bond, which threatens Antonio's life, creates the central conflict of the play. His willingness to accept such a dangerous arrangement illustrates his loyalty and love for Bassanio, emphasizing the theme of friendship that runs throughout the story.

Furthermore, Antonio's interactions with Shylock provide insight into the themes of justice and mercy. His passive acceptance of Shylock’s terms reflects a sense of nobility but also highlights his underestimation of Shylock's determination for revenge. This tension between Antonio and Shylock is essential, as it contrasts the notions of mercy and strict justice. Antonio’s eventual willingness to show mercy towards Shylock, along with his acceptance of the court's judgment, reinforces the play's exploration of these themes.

Additionally, Antonio's character influences the actions of others, particularly Portia. Her determination to save Antonio during the trial demonstrates his significance to her motivations and actions. She acts not only to protect him but also to assert the value of mercy over revenge, a lesson that resonates throughout the play.

Antonio's character is also a representation of the societal norms and values of the time. His honorable demeanor and adherence to the principles of trade reflect the ideals of Venice as a mercantile society. However, his relationships with characters like Shylock and Bassanio also expose the underlying tensions of class, religion, and personal loyalty, making him a complex and multifaceted character.

QUESTION III

(5 Marks)

1. “It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven Upon the place beneath.”

The line, "It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven Upon the place beneath," is a powerful metaphor from William Shakespeare's ‘The Merchant of Venice’. In Act IV, Scene 1, Portia

speaks these words while disguised as a lawyer, arguing for mercy over strict justice. This line highlights her plea for mercy to be shown to Antonio, who is bound by a harsh agreement with Shylock, a moneylender demanding a pound of flesh.

Portia compares mercy to rain, which gently falls from heaven and blesses the earth below without discrimination. This comparison implies that mercy, like rain, is a natural, gracious act that doesn't need to be forced or bargained for; instead, it flows freely and benefits both the giver and receiver. The rain from heaven nourishes the earth, bringing life and growth, and mercy similarly enriches human relationships by bringing harmony, peace, and understanding.

Furthermore, this comparison emphasizes the divine quality of mercy. Just as rain comes from the heavens, mercy is seen as a godly virtue, elevating the one who shows it and aligning them with divine values. By choosing mercy over revenge or punishment, a person demonstrates a compassionate, noble character. In this way, Portia suggests that justice without mercy is incomplete, and that true justice should always include compassion and forgiveness. Her speech ultimately serves as a call for empathy and humanity, portraying mercy as essential to a fair and moral society.

2. "Give me my principal, and let me go."

The line "Give me my principal, and let me go" is spoken by Shylock, the moneylender in William Shakespeare's 'The Merchant of Venice'. This line occurs during the climactic trial scene in Act IV, where Shylock is demanding a pound of Antonio's flesh as repayment for a defaulted loan. Shylock's "principal" here refers to the original sum of money he lent to Antonio.

By this point in the trial, Shylock has realized he cannot lawfully take his "bond" (the pound of flesh), due to Portia's clever legal argument. Shylock then shifts his demand, asking simply to get his initial loan back and leave. This line reflects his frustration and resignation. He no longer seeks revenge on Antonio but simply wants to be released from the trap he finds himself in.

Shylock's shift in demands marks a turning point. It shows his diminishing power as the trial no longer goes in his favor. His demand for the principal highlights his sense of defeat and how he's forced to abandon his desire for justice, or rather revenge, in the face of the law's interpretation. It is a moment of vulnerability, as Shylock, once so determined to carry out the

terms of the bond, now only wants his money back and to end the ordeal. This line captures the themes of justice, mercy, and revenge that permeate the play.

3. “Shed thou no blood; nor cut thou lese, nor more, But just a pound of flesh”

In the Merchant of Venice, Act IV, Scene 1, the line "Shed thou no blood; nor cut thou less, nor more, but just a pound of flesh" is spoken by Portia, who is disguised as a young lawyer defending Antonio in the trial against Shylock. Shylock insists on his right to a pound of Antonio's flesh as repayment for an unpaid loan. Portia agrees that Shylock may take his bond, but she sets strict conditions: he must take exactly one pound of flesh, without shedding a single drop of blood, and without cutting even a fraction more or less than a pound.

By imposing this condition, Portia cleverly uses the law to save Antonio while exposing the flaw in Shylock’s rigid pursuit of revenge. Since it is impossible to remove flesh without shedding blood, Portia’s demand makes it impossible for Shylock to fulfill his bond without breaking the law himself. This turning point highlights the themes of justice, mercy, and the limitations of seeking vengeance without compassion. Through this argument, Portia demonstrates that true justice is not found in strict adherence to the letter of the law, but rather in tempering justice with mercy and humanity.

4. “I am a tainted wether of the flock, Meetest for death. The weakest kind of fruit”

In ‘The Merchant of Venice’, Act IV, Scene 1, Antonio speaks the line, "I am a tainted wether of the flock, Meetest for death. The weakest kind of fruit," in a moment of resignation to his seemingly inevitable fate. By referring to himself as a "tainted wether," or an old, castrated, and diseased sheep, he uses a powerful metaphor that suggests he is the least valuable and most dispensable member of the "flock," worthy only of death. This sense of worthlessness is intensified when he compares himself to "the weakest kind of fruit," symbolizing something past its prime and ready to fall.

Antonio’s words reveal his despair and willingness to accept death, seeing himself as a burden with little to contribute. His sorrowful tone contrasts with Shylock’s cold determination to exact the bond, underscoring the themes of mercy and justice in the play. Antonio’s acceptance of his role as "the weakest" also speaks to his loyalty and selflessness, as he faces death for his friend

Bassanio's sake. In this way, he embodies sacrificial love, which stands in sharp contrast to Shylock's desire for revenge.

This scene is significant not only because it reveals Antonio's character but also because it highlights the conflict between mercy and vengeance. While Shylock insists on justice, Antonio's humility and willingness to die for his friend show the importance of compassion and humanity, essential themes in the play. Antonio's acceptance of his fate creates a powerful emotional appeal, emphasizing that true worth is found not in wealth or social status but in selfless acts of loyalty and love.

5. "Let me have my judgement and the Jew his will"

The line *"Let me have my judgement and the Jew his will"* is spoken by Antonio in Act IV, Scene 1, of *The Merchant of Venice*, during the trial scene. It reflects Antonio's resignation and acceptance of his fate as Shylock insists on the fulfilment of the bond for a pound of flesh. Antonio shows no attempt to plead for mercy or resist Shylock's demands. Instead, he submits to the law and accepts what he believes to be inevitable, demonstrating his stoic character. His calm and dignified demeanour contrasts sharply with Shylock's vengeful determination, emphasizing the moral and emotional stakes in the scene.

This line encapsulates Antonio's noble acceptance of his predicament and serves as a critical moment in the play, underlining the themes of justice, mercy, and the human capacity for endurance in the face of adversity. It also emphasizes Shylock's relentless pursuit of the bond, paving the way for the dramatic reversal that follows.

6. "He shall have nothing but the penalty"

The line *"He shall have nothing but the penalty"* is spoken by Portia in Act IV, Scene 1, of *The Merchant of Venice*. Disguised as the lawyer Balthazar, Portia uses this statement to deliver the final twist in the trial scene, turning Shylock's insistence on strict justice against him.

This line marks the climactic reversal of Shylock's fortunes. After Shylock insists on the enforcement of the bond, Portia cleverly interprets the law to deny him any claim beyond the exact penalty—one pound of flesh. Crucially, Portia points out that Shylock cannot spill any of Antonio's blood, effectively rendering the penalty impossible to execute.

Portia's words highlight the importance of precision in legal arguments. By adhering strictly to the letter of the bond, she demonstrates her intellectual prowess and Shylock's overreliance on rigid justice.

While the line asserts justice, it also exposes the limits of mercy in the Christian characters. Although Shylock is legally outmanoeuvred, the ensuing penalties imposed on him—loss of wealth and forced conversion—cast doubt on the moral high ground claimed by the victors.

This line serves as a pivotal moment in the play, demonstrating Portia's brilliance and sealing Shylock's fate, while prompting the audience to reflect on the nature of fairness and forgiveness.

7. "To do a great right, do a little wrong."

The line *"To do a great right, do a little wrong"* is spoken by Bassanio in Act IV, Scene 1, of *The Merchant of Venice*. It reflects Bassanio's suggestion that bending the law slightly would be justified to save Antonio's life, illustrating the moral and ethical dilemmas that permeate the play.

Bassanio speaks these words during the trial scene when it seems that Shylock's demand for a pound of flesh from Antonio will be enforced. In desperation, Bassanio urges the court to act pragmatically, even if it means straying from strict legal principles.

The line encapsulates a conflict between justice and mercy, as well as the tension between adhering to the law and ensuring a just outcome. Bassanio's plea highlights the complexity of balancing ethical principles with practical outcomes. Bassanio argues from a utilitarian perspective, suggesting that a small moral compromise (a "little wrong") is justified if it prevents a greater injustice (Antonio's death). This introduces a nuanced view of morality into the courtroom drama.

Bassanio's appeal contrasts with Portia's eventual strategy, which adheres strictly to the law while achieving a morally favourable outcome. It demonstrates differing approaches to resolving ethical conflicts. The line reflects one of the play's central themes: the interplay between rigid justice and flexible mercy. It also reveals Bassanio's deep loyalty to Antonio, willing to compromise moral integrity to save his friend.

8. "A Daniel come to judgment: yea a Daniel!"

In The Merchant of Venice, Act IV, Scene I, during the intense trial scene, Shylock exclaims, “A Daniel come to judgment: yea, a Daniel!” Here, Shylock praises the young doctor of law, who is Portia in disguise, saying, "An ideal judge has come to decide this case! A judge as wise and discerning as Daniel! O wise young judge, how should I honor you!"

Shylock’s praise for Portia comes just after Bassanio, in a desperate attempt to save Antonio, asks her to find a way to go around the law. He argues that bending the rules just a little would be a small price to pay to prevent Shylock’s cruelty. However, Portia, staying in character as the young doctor, denies this request firmly. She explains that no authority in Venice, not even the court, has the right to alter the law in any way. She further explains that if they were to make an exception now, it could set a dangerous precedent—one that might allow others to bend or misuse the law in the future for their own selfish purposes. This could lead to serious abuses and make the law unreliable.

Thus, she insists that even a minor irregularity could open the door to much greater harm, and for that reason, the law must be followed exactly as it is written, no matter the consequences.

9. “What judgment shall I dread, doing no wrong?"

The line is spoken by Shylock in The Merchant of Venice, Act IV, Scene I. Shylock says this in response to the duke, who has questioned him about his lack of mercy toward Antonio. The duke asks Shylock how he can expect mercy if he refuses to show any himself. However, shylock replies that he has nothing to fear, as he believes he is simply exercising his legal rights and therefore “doing no wrong.” Shylock also refers to the fact that he had no instigation towards the insults targeted at him by Antonio earlier. He was humiliated merely for being a Jew.

In reply, Shylock confidently asserts that he has nothing to fear from judgment because, in his view, he is doing nothing wrong by strictly enforcing his legal contract with Antonio. Shylock defends his claim to the "pound of flesh" by comparing it to the way Venetians treat their slaves, which they consider their property. He argues that, just as they believe they have the right to do as they please with their slaves, he should have the right to claim his bond, as Antonio’s flesh was “dearly bought.”

Shylock is essentially challenging the moral authority of the court by implying that Venetian society itself practices harshness and ownership, yet expects him to act differently. This line

reveals Shylock's sense of ruthless determination to stick to the law, as he believes that enforcing the bond is within his legal rights, even if it seems merciless.

10. "It is an attribute to God himself."

The line is spoken by Portia in The Merchant of Venice, Act IV, Scene I, during her famous "mercy speech" in the trial scene. Disguised as a young doctor of law, Portia addresses Shylock and appeals to his sense of compassion, encouraging him to show mercy toward Antonio instead of demanding the pound of flesh as agreed in their bond.

Portia's speech describes mercy as a divine quality, one that "droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven," blessing both the giver and the receiver. By saying, "It is an attribute to God himself," Portia emphasizes that mercy is a virtue connected to the divine, something greater than mere earthly power. She explains that true strength lies not in enforcing punishment or power but in showing compassion, which reflects God's own nature. Portia argues that kings and rulers appear closest to God when they temper justice with mercy, showing that the highest form of power comes from kindness and forgiveness.

Portia's appeal is meant to convince Shylock that he would gain greater respect and moral authority by showing mercy, aligning himself with divine qualities. Through this speech, Portia tries to sway Shylock's heart, suggesting that in choosing mercy, he would embody both justice and compassion, reflecting the values held by God himself.

11. "I'll not answer that: But say, it is my humor".

The line "I'll not answer that: But say, it is my humor" is spoken by Shylock in 'The Merchant of Venice', Act IV, Scene I. Shylock says this to the duke during the trial scene when the duke, hoping for mercy, suggests that Shylock will ultimately forgive Antonio's debt rather than insist on the pound of flesh. The duke believes that Shylock's harshness is only for show and that he will eventually act with compassion. However, Shylock makes it clear that he intends to claim the bond, no matter what anyone expects of him.

When Shylock says, "I'll not answer that: But say, it is my humor," he is responding to the duke's question about why he would rather have Antonio's flesh than the large sum of money offered in repayment. By "humor," Shylock essentially means his personal inclination or desire, something that cannot be logically explained. He argues that his insistence on the pound of flesh is simply his choice, similar to how some people have irrational likes or dislikes—such

as disliking certain animals or sounds for no clear reason. Shylock uses this argument to assert that his preference for revenge over money is simply an emotional inclination that he doesn't need to justify.

This line reflects Shylock's deep-seated hatred for Antonio, which he describes as a "lodged hate and a certain loathing." He acknowledges that there may be no logical reason for his desire, yet his hatred drives him to demand Antonio's flesh rather than settle for repayment. This response reinforces Shylock's determination to follow through with the bond, showing his willingness to pursue his grudge even when offered alternatives.

12. "Thou almost makest me waver in my faith, to hold opinion with Pythagoras".

The line "Thou almost makest me waver in my faith, to hold opinion with Pythagoras" is spoken by Gratiano during the trial scene in Act IV, Scene I of The Merchant of Venice. This occurs as Gratiano passionately argues against Shylock's demand for a pound of flesh from Antonio, reflecting his outrage at Shylock's cruelty.

Gratiano's reference to Pythagoras, the ancient Greek philosopher who believed in the transmigration of souls, suggests that he is so repulsed by Shylock's lack of compassion that he momentarily considers the possibility that Shylock's soul might be that of a predatory animal, like a wolf. This metaphor underscores Shylock's perceived inhumanity and reinforces Gratiano's view that Shylock is devoid of mercy.

The context of this line is crucial as it highlights the intense emotional stakes of the trial. Gratiano's outburst reveals not only his disdain for Shylock but also the broader societal tensions between Christians and Jews in Venice. By invoking Pythagoras, Gratiano expresses his frustration with a system that allows such cruelty to flourish, thus questioning the moral fabric of their society.

Ultimately, this line encapsulates the themes of justice and mercy within the play. It critiques a legal system that prioritizes rigid adherence to law over compassion, urging audiences to reflect on the consequences of allowing vengeance to overshadow humanity. Gratiano's struggle with his faith in light of Shylock's actions serves as a poignant reminder of the complexities inherent in human nature and the need for empathy within the framework of justice.

13. "How shall thou hope for Mercy rendering None?"

The quote “How shall thou hope for mercy rendering none?” is spoken by the Duke in Act 4, Scene 1 of The Merchant of Venice, during the intense courtroom scene where Shylock demands his legal right to claim a pound of flesh from Antonio. This moment is pivotal in the play, as it encapsulates the central conflict between justice and mercy. In this context, the Duke addresses Shylock directly, questioning the validity of his expectation for mercy when he himself is unwilling to show any. The tone of the Duke's question is one of stern admonition and moral inquiry, reflecting disappointment and frustration toward Shylock's rigid adherence to the law without compassion. This line serves as a powerful critique of Shylock’s character, emphasizing his inflexible stance and lack of empathy for Antonio, who is facing dire consequences. The emotional weight behind the Duke's words underscores a broader theme in the play: the necessity of mercy within the framework of justice. The Duke’s inquiry highlights the moral dilemma at play—how can one expect kindness or leniency if they are not willing to extend it to others? This moment invites both Shylock and the audience to reflect on the implications of a legal system that prioritizes strict adherence to law over compassion and understanding. Furthermore, the Duke’s question serves as a call for introspection, urging Shylock to reconsider his position and the consequences of his actions. It emphasizes that true justice cannot exist in a vacuum devoid of mercy; rather, it requires a balance between legal rights and human compassion. The tension in this scene is palpable, as it raises critical questions about morality, justice, and the human condition. In summary, the Duke’s question not only critiques Shylock's lack of mercy but also encapsulates a key theme of The Merchant of Venice. It reflects the emotional turmoil present in the courtroom while inviting reflection on the importance of empathy in achieving true justice. This moment serves as a powerful reminder that mercy is an essential component of justice, urging all characters—and by extension, the audience—to consider their own capacity for compassion in the face of conflict.

14. “And by our Holy Sabbath have I sworn to have the due and forfeit of my bond.”

The line “And by our Holy Sabbath have I sworn to have the due and forfeit of my bond” is spoken by Shylock in Act IV, Scene I of The Merchant of Venice. This moment occurs during the climactic trial where Shylock insists on enforcing the bond he made with Antonio, which stipulates a pound of flesh as collateral for a loan.

Shylock’s invocation of the “Holy Sabbath” underscores the seriousness of his oath and highlights his commitment to the bond despite the pleas for mercy from Antonio and others.

By referencing his religious beliefs, Shylock emphasizes that his demand is not just a legal obligation but also a moral one, rooted in his identity as a Jew. This insistence reveals his deep-seated desire for justice and revenge against Antonio, who has wronged him in the past.

The context of this line is significant as it illustrates Shylock's unwavering resolve to claim what he believes is rightfully his. His character embodies the themes of justice versus mercy and the consequences of rigid adherence to law without compassion. Shylock's refusal to show leniency reflects his own experiences of discrimination and humiliation at the hands of Venetian society, particularly from Christians like Antonio.

Ultimately, this line encapsulates Shylock's tragic predicament. While he seeks justice, his insistence on the bond leads to his downfall, revealing how vengeance can blind individuals to their own humanity. Shakespeare uses this moment to critique a legal system that allows for such cruelty and to explore the complexities of justice, identity, and morality within the play.

15. "Thou shall have justice more than thou desir'st."

The line "Thou shalt have justice more than thou desir'st" is spoken by Portia, disguised as the lawyer Balthazar, in Act IV, Scene I of The Merchant of Venice. This pivotal moment occurs during the trial when Shylock insists on his right to claim a pound of flesh from Antonio as stipulated in their bond.

Portia's declaration serves multiple purposes. First, it underscores her role as a mediator in the conflict between Shylock and Antonio. By promising Shylock "justice more than thou desir'st," she implies that the legal system will uphold the bond, but she also hints at the consequences that will follow from such strict adherence to the law. This statement foreshadows the dramatic turn of events where Shylock's rigid interpretation of justice ultimately leads to his own downfall.

The context of this line is crucial; it reflects the tension between justice and mercy that permeates the play. Portia's assertion can be interpreted as both a warning and a challenge to Shylock. While she acknowledges his legal rights, she simultaneously prepares to expose the limitations of his claim. The irony lies in the fact that Shylock's desire for strict justice will not yield the satisfaction he expects; instead, it will result in severe repercussions for him.

Furthermore, this line highlights Portia's intelligence and cunning as she navigates the intricacies of the law. She understands that true justice must encompass mercy and compassion, which contrasts sharply with Shylock's vengeful stance. By promising more justice than

Shylock desires, Portia sets the stage for her subsequent argument about mercy, ultimately illustrating that a legalistic approach devoid of empathy can lead to tragic outcomes.

In conclusion, Portia's proclamation encapsulates one of the central themes of The Merchant of Venice: the delicate balance between justice and mercy. It serves as a reminder that while laws are essential for order, they must be tempered with understanding and compassion to achieve true justice. Through this moment, Shakespeare invites audiences to reflect on their own interpretations of justice and the moral implications of their actions within society.

16. "You take my house when you do take the prop that doth sustain my house".

The line "You take my house when you do take the prop that doth sustain my house" was said by the Jew, Shylock during the trial court of justice in Venice.

Portia managed to save Antonio by pointing out in the bond that there is no mention whatever of even the smallest drop of blood. The words clearly say 'a pound of flesh'. She tells Shylock to take the forfeit in his agreement which is just a pound of flesh. However, in the process of cutting it, if he sheds one drop of blood of a Christian citizen, then all his wealth and positions will be forfeited to the Government, according to the laws of Venice.

Upon hearing this Shylock wanted his sum of money back which Bassanio offered him previously but Portia stops him to pay as Shylock has already said before all present in the court, that he will not have it. All he wants is strict justice on the payment of the penalty.

Portia further states that there is a statute in the Venetian law that declares that if a foreigner conspires against the life of any citizen of Venice, either directly or indirectly, then the person whom he has plotted against is entitled to half his wealth. The rest is to be handed over to the private treasury of the State; and the life of the plotter himself depends solely on the will of the duke without appeal. Shylock has brought upon himself the punishment; thus, he should kneel before the duke at once and plead for mercy.

The duke says that he grants Shylock his life before he asks for it, in order to show him the difference between his nature and the nature of a Christian. As for half his riches, they now belong to Antonio, the merchant he plotted against. The other half belongs to the State, but if he repents and humbly begs for mercy, the State may just impose a fine, instead of taking the full amount. Shylock then says that they may as well take his life to. It is no use sparing his

life, seeing that they have taken away his means of subsistence reducing him to beggary since he makes his life living by lending out his money.

17. "…. It blesseth him that gives and him that takes."

The line "…. It blesseth him that gives and him that takes" was said by Portia disguised as Balthazar in the court of trial in Venice.

Portia makes an impassioned plea for mercy and explains that the very characteristic of mercy is that there can be no compulsion in its exercise. It is beyond a power of man and the law to compel a man to be merciful. Mercy is a purely voluntary action, whereas justice has the compelling force of the law behind it. Its very nature to is to fall like rain. Just as no man can command the rain to fall, so also, no man can command mercy. Mercy shows itself of its own accord. Just as rain is pleasing and beneficial in its effects by refreshing the weary earth, so mercy is an agreeable beneficial attribute of the human heart. It carries with it a twofold power and a double blessing. It benefits and makes happy both the giver and the receiver.

Portia continues to say mercy is not an attribute of weakness. She says its effect is greatest and noblest when exercised by the great and the powerful, where the law gives them absolute power to enforce justice. It sheds upon a royal king a brighter lustre than the crown which he wears, which is an emblem of his sovereign authority.

As she speaks of mercy, Portia tells the Jew to consider, that though he asks for justice, or more if strict justice meant to be meted out to all, no one can enter heaven. We all pray to God for mercy, not for justice. We pray to him to 'forgive' us our trespasses that we may forgive those who trespass against us. He who needs God's mercy to be shown to him, should show mercy to the man who needs it from him. Therefore, Portia requests Shylock not press for bare justice in the case but to forego his legal rights, and to season justice with mercy.

18. "The pound of flesh which I demand of him is dearly bought, 'tis mine and I will have it"

The line "The pound of flesh which I demand of him is dearly bought, 'tis mine and I will have it" was said by Shylock, the Jew in the court of Venice.

When the Duke asked Shylock how he can hope for mercy from God, if he shows no mercy to others, he answers him by saying that he did not fear any punishment, because he has done no

wrong, as he is asking for nothing but justice. As for questioning him why he does not treat others as he would be treating himself, he says the Christians do not do any better. He says the Christians all possess slaves whom they employ in servile tasks, as they employ their donkeys, dogs and mules. The reason why they justify themselves for this treatment of them, is that they are theirs by right of purchase. He says that if he tells them to give their slaves their freedom and allow them to intermarry with their families, give them comfortable beds to sleep on and reach food to eat, the Christians will reply that they can treat their massive please as they are their property, having given payment for them. Shylock says his reply is the same. The pound of flesh which he claims from Antonio has been bought by him at a high price. It is his own and he insists on having it. If the Duke refuses him, then he will be making an open confession that the law of Venice is a mere dead letter. It will be held up to shame. He demands justice. He asks the duke whether he intends to give it to him or not.

19. "What! Wouldst, thou have a serpent sting thee twice?"

The line "What! Wouldst, thou have a serpent sting thee twice?" was said by Shylock, the Jew in the court of Venice.

Bassanio asks Shylock whether a man is obliged to seek the death of everything he dislikes. Shylock replies with another question, he wants to know when a man hates a thing intensely, why should he not kill it willingly. Bassanio argues that a first offence does not arouse so fierce hatred as killing one. Shylock answers Bassanio whether he would give a serpent a second chance to sting him, meaning whether he would give an enemy the chance to hurt him a second time.

Shylock hates Antonio. He has a bias against Antonio as a Christian and hates him even more for Antonio's practice of lending money without interest, undermining Shylock's usury business. Shylock wants revenge for years of Antonio's mistreatment. On several occasions, Antonio insulted him openly and even spat on him. These instigated Shylock's pure hatred towards Antonio and wanting his death.

20. "The Jew shall have all justice; soft! No haste: He shall have nothing but the penalty."

The line "The Jew shall have all justice; soft! No haste: He shall have nothing but the penalty." was spoken by Portia disguised as Balthazar in the court of Venice.

Portia wins the case in the favour of Antonio by pointing out that in the bond there is no mention whatever of even the smallest drop of blood. The words clearly say ‘a pound of flesh’. She tells Shylock to take the forfeit in his agreement which is just a pound of flesh. However, in the process of cutting it, if he sheds one drop of blood of a Christian citizen, then all his wealth and possessions will be forfeited to the Government according to the laws of Venice.

In answer to that, Shylock says he will accept the offer of money which was made at first and would release Antonio from his bond on payment of three times the amount of his debt. Bassanio eagerly tries to hand in the money but Portia stops him and states that Shylock shall have the justice he asked for. She even denied Shylock of the mere principal, the amount that he lent to Antonio.

GROUP-B

(2 Marks)

1. Why is a native ashamed of speaking cockney dialect?

The word ‘cockney' means ‘city dweller.’ It is most likely derived from a term used to derogatorily describe inhabitants of the then-crowded, disease-ridden, and filthy towns in medieval times. Although its geographic range has significantly diminished, the East End of London is still home to the Cockney dialect of English. It has several distinguishing characteristics that are well known to many English speakers, and it is often linked with the working-class residents of London, known as cockneys. Due to its use is related to lower class people, native is often ashamed speaking cockney dialect.

2. What is the advice that Shaw gives to foreign speakers of English language?

George Bernard Shaw emphasizes that there is no such thing as perfectly correct English and there is presentable English which is called “Good English”. In London, Shaw points out that nine hundred ninety nine out of every thousand people don’t only speak bad English but speak even that very badly. They neither speak it correctly nor be understood when it is well spoken. He suggests the foreigners, to speak with a foreign accent, and speak broken English, that is English without grammar. Then, the native understands the foreigner and try to understand and

gets ready to help. The native never expects the foreigner to be polite and to use elaborate grammatical phrases.

3. "Even among English people, to speak well is a pedantic affectation." What then would be the most natural thing among Englishmen?

If "to speak well is a pedantic affectation" among English people, then the most natural thing among Englishmen would be to speak in a less formal, more natural way. G.B. Shaw suggests that one must not speak too well even with cultivated people, during private conversation also. While dispelling the fears of foreigners with regard to the language G.B. Shaw says that little knowledge is adequate to travel England, and adds that to speak too well is a pedantic affectation, even among English people. G.B. Shaw says that is an insult to the native who can't understand his own language when it is too well spoken.

4. According to Shaw what are the two simplest and commonest words in the English language? Do the members of the committee agree to the pronunciation of these two words?

According to Shaw what are the two simplest and commonest words in the English language are 'yes' and 'no'.

Shaw tells the audience that he is a member of a committee named British Broadcasting Corporation. Many great writers and poets, even poet laureates and actors are members of BBC. They all are experts at speaking English but still, there are arguments among them on deciding the correct pronunciation of even simplest English words.

Those simple words that Shaw is talking about are 'yes' and 'no'. Thus, his point is that even after years of experience and public speaking, even the greatest English speakers have different pronunciations for the words 'yes' and 'no'. However, what is important here to notice is that despite having different pronunciations, those speakers will say these two words in a way that they are easily understandable to all humans. This makes them look highly literate and different from uneducated people.

5. What examples does Shaw give to distinguish between company manners and home manners?

Shaw classifies manners into two types namely Company Manners and Home Manners which also vary according to the situation. Family members do not speak among themselves in the manner as they do on ordinary occasions when they are in the presence of an outsider. Shaw further adds by citing an example of 'key hole moral'.

Shaw says that his audience can do an experiment. If they just listen to a common family through a keyhole, they will find that the family members speak in a mumbled unclear way. But when they open the door, the family will start speaking in a clear and publicly understandable way. This is what Shaw calls the difference between company manners and family manners. Both these manners apply to everyone.

Another example that Shaw gives of the difference between company manners and family members is that to ask time to a stranger, Shaw will need to ask him properly to be understandable. But to his wife, he can just say "cloxst?" and his wife will understand. Shaw even says that he is talking to the listeners more carefully than he would speak to his wife.

6. What are the defects of our civilization?

The first Defect: Disparity in sharing of the National Income*:* Today, the sharing of national wealth, food, clothing, houses and other amenities is still very unfair. Some people live in luxury and many others do not have enough to eat, drink and wear. Today, in England, thousands of people live in dreadful surroundings. There are many families with eight to ten persons who live in a single room. In this room they are born and in this same room they die, because, they are too poor to afford another room. Until everyone gets his proper share of necessary things our civilization will not be perfect.

The Second Defect: The Danger of war*:* A still greater danger comes from war. Four years from 1914 to 1918, the most destructive was that the world has known, took place between the great nations of Western Europe. The chief causes for this war were fear and pride. Each nation was afraid of the power of the other nation and each nation was too proud to admit it. Today, each nation is spending its greater part of its budget on war preparations thus leading to another which will probably burn up entire civilization altogether. However, to prevent the impending

danger, all nations decide to set up League of Nations, the chief hope of the world, to settle disputes between the nations and ensure peace.

The Third Defect: The Danger from Machines*:* The third great defect of our civilization is that we do not know how to manage our machines. Machines were made to be man's servants; yet, they have grown to become his masters. Moreover, the machines are very stern masters. They must be fed with coal, given petrol to drink, oil to wash with and they must be kept at the right temperature. So, we have to wait upon them attentively and do all that we can to keep them in a good temper. The time may come when they rule us altogether, just as we rule the animals.

Thus, these are the defects of our civilization which C E M Joad mentions in his essay 'Our Civilization'.

7. Why was the League of Nations formed?

A greater danger comes from war. Four years from 1914 to 1918, the most destructive war that the world has known, took place between the great nations of Western Europe. The war that took place again from 1939 to 1945 almost torn apart the world. The chief causes were fear and pride. Each nation was afraid of the power of the other nations and each nation was too proud to admit it. In spite of this last explosion, today, nations are spending still more money on war preparation thus leading to another destructive blaze which will probably burn up civilization altogether. What may prevent this is a body called the League of Nations, which was set up after the last war. This is a sort of law court for nations to which they could bring their disputes for settlement. Thus, in the League of Nations lies one of the chief hopes in the world.

8. How can our civilization be made the greatest and longest lasting?

C E M Joad believes if man will give his time and energy to removing the causes of quarrels between nations and discovering how to remove poverty then, our civilization would undoubtedly be the greatest, as it would be the most lasting, that there has ever been.

9. How are machines a threat to our civilization?

C E M Joad expresses his apprehension that one day or the other day man may become a slave to his own machines. Machines may become the masters over the men. They may dictate and govern all human beings as we rule our brainless animals today. So, man has to engage himself

to satisfy their (machines) needs and demands or else they may sulk and refuse to work. The author feels that machines are not civilization but aids to civilization.

10.Three hundred years after Amanullah's visit to England, when Afghans read the history books, what would they think of the English?

In *The Civilization of Today*, C.E.M. Joad explores the impact of historical events on the perceptions of different nations. Referring to Amanullah Khan, the King of Afghanistan who visited England in the early 20th century, Joad suggests that three hundred years after this visit, Afghans reading history books would likely view the English with a sense of admiration and respect, but also with a degree of hostility or resentment due to the historical context of colonialism and imperialism.

The English might be seen as a powerful and influential force, but also as an imperial power that had dominated and exploited many nations, including Afghanistan. Their view would likely be shaped by the historical experiences of Afghanistan under British influence, such as the Anglo-Afghan wars and the imposition of British policies in the region.

Thus, while the Afghans might acknowledge the achievements of the English, they would also remember the more contentious aspects of their relationship, leading to a complex and ambivalent perception of the English.

11.What is the full form of B.B.C.

The full form of B.B.C. is British Broadcasting Corporation.

12.Which countries provide date and sugar according to C.E.M Joad?

C.E.M. notes in his work "The Civilization of Today" that **Iraq and Egypt** provide dates, while **Mauritius and the West Indies** provide sugar.

13.Who were the people in the audience who listen to GB Shaw's lecture on Spoken English and Broken English?

George Bernard Shaw's *Spoken English and Broken English* was recorded as a gramophone message, intended to guide learners of English. This lecture targeted foreign students who wished to communicate effectively while traveling or interacting with English-speaking natives. He emphasized that there is no such thing as "perfectly correct English," as even native speakers differ in pronunciation and dialect. He advised learners to focus on speaking "presentably" rather than striving for polished perfection, as overly formal speech might confuse natives. The recording, later broadcast on Manhattan's WNEW radio station, reached a broad audience, including students, educators, and language enthusiasts, offering insights into the diversity and practicality of English communication.

14.According to GB Shaw, who is a confident trickster?

According to George Bernard Shaw in *Spoken English and Broken English*, a "confidence trickster" uses elaborate, overly polished, and formal language to deceive others into believing they are trustworthy or authoritative. Shaw humorously points out that if a foreigner speaks English too perfectly while asking for directions or assistance, they might be mistaken for a beggar or a confidence trickster, as such speech seems unnatural and arouses suspicion among native English speakers.

15.Why are the English not keen to help foreigners who are fluent in English?

According to George Bernard Shaw in *Spoken English and Broken English*, the English are often not keen to help foreigners who speak English too fluently because such perfection in speech feels unnatural and raises suspicion. Native speakers are accustomed to the casual, imperfect use of their language, so a foreigner's overly polished and grammatically precise English can make them appear pedantic or even pretentious. Shaw humorously notes that this might lead to the foreigner being mistaken for someone with ulterior motives, such as a beggar or a confidence trickster, rather than someone genuinely seeking help. This highlights the importance of speaking in a natural and approachable manner rather than striving for perfect accuracy.

16.What is meant by the term 'British Commonwealth"?

The term "British Commonwealth," as used during George Bernard Shaw's time, referred to the group of countries that were part of the British Empire. After decolonization, it evolved

into what is now called the Commonwealth of Nations, which includes former British colonies and territories, along with other countries that chose to remain connected to Britain in a voluntary association. The Commonwealth serves as a political and cultural community with a shared commitment to democracy, human rights, and the rule of law, though it no longer implies political control by the United Kingdom.

In Shaw's context, "British Commonwealth" referred to these countries where English was spoken and where the English language and culture had a significant influence.

17.Why was Shaw chosen as a member of the special committee set up by the B.B.C?

George Bernard Shaw was chosen as a member of the special committee set up by the BBC to decide how the utterances of speakers employed by the corporation should be pronounced to serve as a model of correct English. Shaw was selected because, as a writer of plays, he had extensive experience in supervising rehearsals and critically listening to how actors, who were trained speakers, pronounced their lines. Additionally, Shaw's expertise as a public speaker gave him the ability to discern and refine speech for clarity and correctness. His selection was due to his deep understanding of the nuances of spoken English, making him well-suited for the task of determining a standardized pronunciation for public broadcasts.

18.In what context does G. B. Shaw mention “cloxst”?

George Bernard Shaw mentions the term “cloxst” in a humorous context to illustrate how speech can be casual and imprecise in informal, private settings. He describes how, when speaking to his wife at home, he often speaks carelessly, resulting in words being misheard or slurred. In this case, Shaw says that when he asks his wife for the time, she only hears “cloxst” instead of the full “What o’clock is it?” He humorously notes that this level of carelessness in speech is acceptable in intimate settings but would be unacceptable in formal or public communication, where clarity is essential.

19.According to C.E.M. Joad, from which countries can one get oranges and tea?

According to C.E.M. Joad, oranges come from Brazil and tea from China. He illustrates how the world has transformed into a single place instead of many isolated regions, where things from different parts of the globe are easily available in one place despite their geographical remoteness.

20.To which country did King Amanullah belong? Why did he visit London?

King Amanullah belonged to Afghanistan. He visited London to observe Western civilization. His visit reflects a desire to witness Western advancements and build diplomatic relations. During his stay, he was shown tanks at Lulworth Cove, bombing aeroplanes at Hendon, taken on a submarine trip, and even allowed to fire a torpedo off Spithead.

21.According to C.E.M. Joad, what does the law protect one from?

According to C.E.M. Joad, the law protects us from robbery and violence. It ensures that no one can break into our homes, steal our belongings, or take our children without facing punishment. The law also punishes burglars when they are caught, thereby providing justice and a sense of security.

22.Why does Joad say that Europe looks like “a big-armed Camp"?

Joad describes Europe as "a big-armed camp" because of its militarized nature and the pervasive presence of armed forces. He explains that nations were afraid of each other's power, which led them to spend large sums of money on rifles, cannons, battleships, and training soldiers, making Europe look more like a military camp than a peaceful place.

23.Comment on Bernard Shaw's opinion of ‘ideally correct English’.

Bernard Shaw opines that there is no such thing as "ideally correct English" because no two British subjects speak exactly alike. If we consider one person's speech as correct, it would

suggest that another person's way of speaking is wrong, which is not the case. The variation in English usage highlights the language's diversity, making it impossible to establish a single standard for correctness.

24.What does Shaw say about 'home manners' and 'company manners'?

Shaw states that there is a distinction between home manners and company manners. In a company, we are expected to behave formally and maintain discipline, as we are obligated to certain authorities to uphold a suitable lifestyle. However, at home, we are not required to follow the same protocols, allowing us to be more relaxed and informal, which contributes to a happier and more comfortable environment.

25.What were the primary causes of the First World War?

According to C.E.M. Joad, the primary causes of the First World War were numerous, but the chief factors were fear and pride. Nations were afraid of each other's power but too proud to acknowledge it. As a result, this fear and pride led them to spend significant amounts of money on weapons, building battleships, and training soldiers, causing the war.

26.How is a housewife more fortunate than King Solomon in today's civilization?

The author claims a housewife to be more fortunate than King Solomon in today's civilization because even in his glory he could not access the vast variety of produce that a modern housewife can when shopping at the grocer's. Joad points out that the world has become interconnected, allowing for easy access to goods from different parts of the globe, regardless of geographical distance.

27.Why does C.E.M. Joad say that 'illness is no longer a terrible thing'?

C.E.M. Joad states that "illness is no longer a terrible thing" because the use of anaesthetics has become common. This development has freed people from the fear of pain associated with medical treatments, making the experience of illness less daunting than it once was.

28.Who is Sir Johnston Forbes-Robertson?

Sir Johnston Forbes-Robertson was a prominent English actor and theatrical impresario, born on January 16, 1853, and passing away on November 6, 1937. He is widely regarded as one of the finest actors of his time, particularly noted for his portrayal of Hamlet, which earned him acclaim as the best Hamlet of the Victorian era. Educated at Charterhouse School, Forbes-Robertson initially trained as an artist before turning to acting in 1874. Throughout his career, he performed alongside notable figures such as Sir Henry Irving and was involved in productions of Shakespearean plays. George Bernard Shaw wrote the role of Julius Caesar in Caesar and Cleopatra specifically for him. Knighted in 1913, he retired from acting shortly thereafter but continued to produce plays until his death. His legacy includes a reputation for exceptional elocution and a significant impact on English theatre.

29.Name any one target audience of G.B. Shaw's speech.

One target audience of G.B. Shaw's speech in Spoken English and Broken English includes 'the general public', particularly those interested in the nuances of language and communication. Shaw aimed to address individuals who might be struggling with the complexities of spoken English, including both native speakers and learners. By discussing the importance of clear communication and the impact of language on social interactions, Shaw sought to engage a broad audience that spans various social classes and educational backgrounds. His insights into how language shape's identity and perception resonate with anyone invested in effective communication, making his speech relevant to a diverse group seeking to improve their linguistic skills.

30.According to Shaw, how is the question "What O'clock is it?" heard by a stranger and by his wife?

In Spoken English and Broken English, G.B. Shaw illustrates how the question "What o'clock is it?" is perceived differently depending on the relationship between the speaker and the listener. When a stranger asks this question, it is often viewed as a straightforward inquiry about time, devoid of emotional context or connection. However, when asked by a wife to her husband, it carries deeper implications; it reflects intimacy and familiarity within their relationship. Shaw emphasizes that such questions can reveal underlying emotions or tensions, showcasing how language is not merely about conveying information but also about expressing

feelings and dynamics within personal relationships. This distinction highlights the complexity of communication beyond mere words.

31.“... there have been two revolutions and a great many wars”. What two revolutions does Joad talk about?

C.E.M. Joad refers to the Industrial Revolution and the French Revolution as the two significant revolutions that have profoundly impacted modern civilization. The Industrial Revolution, which began in the late 18th century, transformed economies from agrarian-based systems to industrialized ones, leading to urbanization, technological advancements, and significant changes in labor dynamics. It altered the fabric of society by creating new social classes and changing the nature of work. The French Revolution, occurring in the late 18th century, challenged the established political order and introduced revolutionary ideas such as liberty, equality, and fraternity. It dismantled feudal structures and inspired democratic movements across Europe and beyond. Together, these revolutions not only reshaped economic systems but also influenced political ideologies, setting the stage for modern democratic governance and capitalist economies. Joad emphasizes that these revolutions were pivotal moments that marked the transition into contemporary civilization.

32.Why did previous civilizations come to an end? Name any two places where this happened.

Previous civilizations often came to an end due to a combination of factors, including economic collapse, political instability, social injustice, and external invasions. These elements contributed to the decline of societies that once thrived. For instance, the Roman Empire faced internal strife, such as corruption and civil wars, alongside external pressures from invading tribes like the Visigoths and Vandals. This combination weakened its ability to govern effectively and defend its borders, ultimately leading to its fall. Similarly, the Mayan civilization experienced a decline attributed to environmental degradation, overpopulation, and social upheaval. Deforestation and agricultural practices led to soil depletion, which undermined food production and contributed to societal collapse. Joad uses these examples to illustrate that civilizations must adapt to changing circumstances; failure to do so can result in their eventual demise.

33.What does Joad say about the division of national income?

In his analysis of modern society, Joad discusses the disparity in the division of national income, emphasizing how wealth is unevenly distributed among different segments of the population. He points out that in countries like England, a substantial portion of national income is concentrated in the hands of a small elite while a significant number of people live in poverty or struggle to make ends meet. This inequality creates social tensions and undermines social cohesion, as those at the bottom feel marginalized and disenfranchised. Joad argues that such disparities can lead to instability within society, as economic inequality breeds resentment and conflict. He suggests that a more equitable distribution of wealth is essential for a stable society where all individuals have access to opportunities for growth and prosperity. By highlighting this issue, Joad calls attention to the need for reforms that address economic injustices.

34.Does Shaw encourage listening through keyholes?

In Spoken English and Broken English, G.B. Shaw does not explicitly encourage listening through keyholes; rather, he uses this metaphor to illustrate the nuances of communication and understanding among individuals. He suggests that eavesdropping can provide insight into genuine conversations that reveal true feelings and intentions often masked in formal dialogue. However, he also acknowledges the ethical implications of such actions, indicating that while it may lead to greater understanding, it can also breach privacy and trust. Ultimately, Shaw encourages open communication over secretive listening, advocating for clarity in expression rather than relying on clandestine methods to grasp meaning in conversations between people.

35.According to C.E.M. Joad, what led to the destruction of the ancient civilizations?

C.E.M. Joad identifies several factors that led to the destruction of ancient civilizations, particularly emphasizing moral decay, social injustice, and an inability to adapt to changing conditions. As societies grow complacent or corrupt, they often experience a decline in ethical standards among their leaders and citizens alike. This moral decay can manifest in widespread corruption, loss of civic responsibility, and erosion of social values that once held communities together. Additionally, social injustice—where wealth and power are concentrated in the hands of a few whiles many suffer—can lead to unrest and rebellion among the populace. Furthermore, civilizations that fail to adapt to environmental changes or external pressures risk collapse; for example, resource depletion or climate change can destabilize agricultural systems

essential for survival. Joad's insights highlight how interconnected these factors are in determining a civilization's longevity or demise.

36.What does Joad mean when he says "Today it is the oasis which is spreading over the desert"?

When Joad states, "Today it is the oasis which is spreading over the desert," he employs a metaphorical image to convey that modern civilization is expanding its benefits—such as knowledge, technology, education, and social progress—over areas previously characterized by ignorance or hardship. The "oasis" represents pockets of prosperity and enlightenment that contrast sharply with the surrounding "desert," symbolizing regions or aspects of society suffering from neglect or deprivation. This imagery suggests a hopeful transformation where advancements in civilization can bring improvement and uplift those who have been marginalized or left behind. Joad implies that through education and social reform, society can create fertile ground for growth and development even in challenging environments. Ultimately, this vision reflects an optimistic belief in humanity's capacity for progress and improvement through collective effort and understanding.

37.What is G.B. Shaw's opinion regarding "Ideally correct English"?

George Bernard Shaw argues that "Ideally correct English" is impractical and hinders natural communication, making it sound forced or unnatural. He believes language should be flexible and focused on clarity, not restricted by rigid, formal rules.

38.What advice does G.B. Shaw give to foreigners intending to visit England?

G.B. Shaw advises foreigners visiting England to be prepared for the English people's reserved nature and their strict manners. He humorously suggests that visitors expect formal politeness, be cautious of the unpredictable weather, and adapt to strong English tea. Shaw's advice reflects his playful critique of English customs, helping foreigners understand the cultural quirks they might encounter.

39.What are 'the new and rare things' that C.E.M. Joad talks about?

C.E.M. Joad describes “new and rare things” as technological advancements and changes in social organization, such as automobiles, airplanes, telecommunication, and industrialization. These developments distinguish modern civilization from the past, creating both progress and new challenges.

40.How can machines help in the progress of civilization, as suggested by C.E.M. Joad?

C.E.M. Joad suggests that machines aid civilization by increasing efficiency and productivity, allowing for greater output in industries. They also improve the quality of life by reducing manual labor, facilitating communication and transportation, and driving economic growth through innovation and job creation.

41.What in Joad’s opinion, is the chief difference between previous civilizations and the civilization of today?

In Joad’s opinion, the chief difference between previous civilizations and modern civilization is the overwhelming influence of technology and machinery. While earlier civilizations were primarily shaped by human relationships and cultural values, modern civilization is dominated by industrialization and technological advancements, leading to both significant progress and complexities that challenge traditional social structures and moral values.

42.What in Joad’s opinion, are the chief causes of war among nations?

According to Joad, the chief causes of war among nations are economic rivalry and the desire for power. Nations compete for resources, markets, and economic dominance, leading to conflicts. Additionally, nationalism and the pursuit of political influence drive countries to assert their power, often resulting in war.

43.What is a major benefit of good health enjoyed by the people of modern civilization?

A major benefit of good health enjoyed by people of modern civilization, as suggested by Joad, is an increased lifespan, which allows individuals to be more productive and enjoy a higher quality of life. Advances in medicine, hygiene, and public health contribute to this benefit, enabling people to live longer and healthier lives.

44.Mention the two qualities that C.E.M. Joad speaks of which are recent and rare characteristics of today's civilization.

C.E.M. Joad identifies mechanization and speed as two recent and rare characteristics of today's civilization. Mechanization refers to the widespread use of machines in daily life and industries, while speed highlights the fast pace of life due to advancements in transportation and communication.

45.Name any three major benefits which, according to C.E.M. Joad, have been accomplished by modern civilization.

According to C.E.M. Joad, three major benefits accomplished by modern civilization are:

- Increased Efficiency: Machinery and technology have greatly improved productivity and reduced manual labor.
- Improved Health: Advancements in medicine and public health have led to longer lifespans and better overall health.
- Enhanced Communication and Transportation: Developments in telecommunication and transportation allow people to connect and travel quickly and easily across distances.